

THE  
TRAGEDY  
OF  
ANTI-SEMITISM

*By*

A. K. CHESTERTON  
& JOSEPH LEFTWICH

ANSCOMBE

# THE TRAGEDY OF ANTI-SEMITISM

# THE TRAGEDY OF ANTI-SEMITISM

*by*

A. K. CHESTERTON

*and*

JOSEPH LEFTWICH

ROBERT ANSCOMBE & CO. LTD.

LONDON

*First Edition 1948*

PRINTED BY THE ALGUIN PRESS, WELWYN GARDEN CITY, FOR THE PUBLISHERS,  
ROBERT ANSCOMBE & CO., LTD., 291/293 GRAYS INN ROAD, LONDON, W.C.1.



# CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE . . . . .	7
CHAPTER	
1. IS ANTI-SEMITISM A RACKET? . . . . .	9
2. THE "ALIEN SLANT" . . . . .	19
3. STANDING FORTH AS JEWS . . . . .	38
4. JEWISHNESS AND ENGLISHNESS . . . . .	62
5. JEWISH INTERNATIONAL POWER . . . . .	74
6. LEGENDS ABOUT THE JEWS . . . . .	92
7. THE WRONG SHAPE . . . . .	137
8. POWERFUL JEWISH INFLUENCES . . . . .	195
9. POPULAR ANTI-SEMITISM . . . . .	229
10. JUST BALANCES, JUST WEIGHTS . . . . .	254

## PREFACE

AS this book is unusual, and cast in an unusual form, the reader may welcome a word of explanation of its origin. The idea came to me in the January of 1941. While preparations were going forward for our attack on Italian Somaliland and Abyssinia another officer and myself shared a camp in the jungle overlooking the River Tana. My companion was a kindly, thoughtful man—and a Jew. To the accompaniment of the many hostile noises of the wild, we talked far into each night, more often than not to find ourselves in complete agreement in our views about life and death and the state of this troubled world. It was inevitable that, in due course, our conversation should touch upon the Jewish question. It would be too much to say that we agreed on this most difficult and tremendous question, but I think it can be said that we both discerned the possibilities of an ultimate agreement were the exigencies of war to allow us the time. We did at least discover that it was possible to talk about it rationally and without emotional discolouration. It occurred to me that on my return to civil life I might write a book which would give both points of view and possibly suggest the best grounds for a common understanding. When the time came to carry out the idea, however, I saw at once that, with the best will in the world, such a book would become one-sided and that to preserve the original idea it would be necessary to invite the collaboration of a Jewish writer who would deal with the subject from a Jewish standpoint. I thought at once of Mr. Joseph Leftwich, a man of fearless and independent mind, and laid my proposal before him. The result is the present book. If the reader expects to find in it a solution of the problem of the often disturbed relationship between Gentile and Jew I am afraid he will

be disappointed. It cannot be said that we have reached an agreement, or even come within visible distance of one, but it may be that other minds will take over the task where we have left it and perhaps succeed in building the vital bridge. What the reader will find are essays of great power and eloquence by my collaborator, and a controversy conducted, in the main, without undue heat. Mr. Leftwich claims that he will have failed if it should transpire that he has defended only the Jews and not the principles of right. In the same way, writing on behalf of a point of view the public expression of which is most unfashionable, I too shall have failed if my contribution should be found to buttress prejudice at the expense of reason.

A. K. C.

Is Anti-Semitism a Racket?

MY DEAR LEFTWICH,

I approach the Jewish problem without personal prejudice. This fact is set down for my own satisfaction, since it will be received with derision by people who believe that the man dubbed an anti-semite deals in diabolic prejudices, beyond the reach of reason, justice and even of ordinary common decency. This attitude was summarized by a writer in the *Jewish Chronicle*, who divided anti-semites into only three groups:

1. Unscrupulous liars.
2. Dupes of unscrupulous liars.
3. Emotional defectives who pick upon the helpless Jews as a target for their pathological hatred.

I have never met the anti-semite liars or their dupes, though it is possible they exist. The third seems to me a more plausible group, since one encounters more potential or actual madmen among anti-semites than among any other group of human beings. Even so, it is a mistake to suppose that the Jews are "picked upon" because they are helpless. They are the least helpless of all the peoples on earth.

For my own part, while not running away from the title of anti-semite, I can truthfully say that it gives me no pleasure. I would rather not possess it. The concept of England as a chivalrous and hospitable country is a precious one, which, other things being equal, I should like to cherish. Further, if I have energy to spare for personal hatred, I feel that it would be more usefully directed against those unconscious traitors of my own race who for years have been befuddling and misleading the minds of the British people, thereby furthering their

national disintegration. There are other, more personal reasons why I deplore what I hold to be the present necessity for opposing Jewish influences. As a boy-soldier, slogging and fighting through German East Africa, my best friend and one of the staunchest of my comrades-in-arms was an Italian Jew. In this war, as a man of forty-one, my best friend and most efficient brother-officer in the Abyssinian campaign was a Jew from Nairobi. Between the wars I knew a number of Jews, liked some of them, disliked none so much as I disliked some Gentiles, received kindnesses from several and am happy to think that I was sometimes able to do them kindnesses in return. Neither is anti-semitism a hang-over from my earlier days, for as a young boy in Johannesburg I went to school with scores of Jews, and, so far from being aware of racial antipathy, I not only had some among my friends but resisted the pressure of elders who tried to make me give them up. If personal prejudice were involved, my own would clearly be on the Jewish side. I am what is called an anti-semite mainly because I am a nationalist—a nationalist in the sense that I believe every nation to have its own guiding star which it must follow, its own ideal pattern which it must trace, its own integration which it must maintain, its own vision of the past, its own distinctive character, its own soul. Nationalism, as I see it, is the dynamic of communal aspiration and growth, just as its opposite, cosmopolitanism, is the negation of these things, leading to the uprooting, debasement and decay of spiritual values. Whether I am right or wrong, that is my belief, and my further belief—no less firmly held—is that Jewry at almost every level of contact exerts an influence hostile to this national ideal. The bad Jew shamelessly exploits it. The good Jew, no matter how sympathetic he may be, always tends unconsciously to distort it, and never more so than

when he sincerely espouses it. It is not an act of malice on his part: the phenomenon is entirely due to his essential separateness—the separateness which his refusal of absorption through the ages so signally proclaims. The Gentile not only becomes aware of the distortion, but in time recognizes it as Jewish, since the Jewish personality is tremendous and cannot go unrecognized. As every man wants a home of his own, so does every true man want a country of his own, and the plain truth is that when Jewish influence upon the national life becomes too marked the non-Jew, recognizing the alien slant, begins to feel a stranger in his own land. Thus is anti-semitism born.

I have said that every true man wants a country of his own, but non-Zionist Jews are an exception and they are none the less true men on that account. How can I picture to them—and to you, my dear Leftwich, who are one of them—the feeling of a man towards his native land and its continuing traditions? The most sacred thing in your life, if I read you aright, is your religion. Suppose then that, while some of the British people sneered at your religion and sought to exploit it, others became converts and rose to high positions as rabbis and elders: suppose that in the result your doctrines were distorted by a distinctively British (or Christian) slant, imparted by even the most orthodox, and that Britons were also prominent among the schismatists and despoilers: suppose, further, that Britons gradually abrogated—or seemed to abrogate—to themselves the right to speak and act on behalf of Hebraism! Would it be surprising if Jews ceased to feel that their religion was their own? Could they not be forgiven, in the circumstances, if they became anti-British? The analogy, of course, is not precise, since Jews do not usurp the functions of the Christian priesthood: my only reason for drawing it is to try and find a parallel which will illustrate the sense of alienation from his own

traditions arising in the Gentile mind when the Jew begins to take any considerable part in the ordering of his affairs. However, with your permission, I will now set down a more exact analogy, although it will necessarily be one lacking so powerful an appeal to people like yourself, who are not Zionists. Let us, for this purpose, suppose that the dispersion of the Jews never took place; that they have enjoyed the continuing habitation of Palestine with full national sovereignty; and that, instead of the Jews, it was the English who became fully dispersed over both the Old World and the New. It is difficult to imagine what would have happened to Palestine if it had remained in Jewish possession. So gifted and vigorous a people would almost certainly have placed their native land in the vanguard of the nations, and perhaps have been impelled by their own ferment to overflow their own boundaries to found an empire. At any rate I ask you to imagine that modern Palestine is now an Imperial power, and that there is an English minority both in the central citadel of Jewry and in its various dominions, as well as in those countries which are Palestine's most formidable rivals.

The English in Palestine, as elsewhere, complain bitterly of anti-English feeling: they describe it as religious prejudice; they say it is due to Jewish envy of their superior talents, that the Jews who criticize them are all liars or bullies, and they agitate for special legislation to make "anti-Englishism" a crime. They demand the right to full Jewish citizenship and at the same time they desire to remain a corporate English entity, affiliated with English entities in every part of the globe. Some among them—and those by no means the least influential—are clamouring for the Jews to restore England to them, at the expense of peoples who have been living there for many centuries and who have racial ties with Western Europe which Jewry's world position makes it suicidal to offend.

Meanwhile, the Jews are becoming more than a little alarmed at the extension of English influence throughout the land—an influence which tends to distort Jewish life and tradition. Although a small minority, the English are prominent in every Jewish political party; they do not hesitate to speak on behalf of Palestine as though they were the possessors of the land; they have accepted Jewish titles of nobility by the score; they have adopted Jewish names by the thousand; they have become associated with all those phases of Jewish life which the best Jews hold to be demoralizing; and by virtue of their advertising leverage they manage to keep all discussion of their distinctive activities out of the Jewish Press and the Jewish broadcasting programmes, so that the position is reached wherein Jews can publicly criticize whom they will so long as they do not publicly criticize the English. Yet in spite of all this passionate identification with Jewish national life, the English will not be absorbed—they insist upon remaining Englishmen.

If this were the whole story the impartial observer in Palestine would well understand the feeling of the Jews that their nationhood was being undermined, and would not need to look further for reasons to explain the phenomenon of "Anti-Englishism". But it is only a part of the story. There has also to be considered the commercial enterprise of the English, which has enabled them to establish a virtual monopoly in many departments of the Palestinian economy. They are not to be found among the primary producers and they are not in the main famous as inventors of industrial processes or as mechanics and engineers. Instead, their peculiar bent lies in the financial exploitation of the articles produced. They have become the master middlemen, not only of Palestine, but of the world, and in spheres of commerce wherein they have specialized it is more or less impossible for the Jews



to compete against them. Much more serious, from the Jewish point of view, is the fact that the English, working very often through Jewish stooges, have built up a colossal world financial power which, in the opinion of many Jews, makes them the masters of mankind. That financial power, intimately related to political power, is believed to subserve the interests of English internationalism at the expense of Jewish national interests, and which—whether it be true or not—certainly operates to the sole advantage of the money-racket and to the grievous hurt of the economic needs of mankind.

It cannot be said of the English in Palestine or elsewhere that they have gained notoriety in any department of crime except one—the commercial. But here they are paramount, being found almost habitually at the heart of huge conspiracies. This trait is thrown into special prominence in time of war, when restrictions upon legal trading naturally open up vast opportunities for illegal practices. Many English have fought bravely in the wars waged by Jewry on behalf of civilization, and many have given their lives to the common cause, but nevertheless the cold, hard fact is that they do not come before public notice by virtue of their martial qualities, but because they play so large a part in these malpractices, besides appearing to take the lion's share of legitimate contracts for feeding and clothing the Jewish armed forces. Furthermore, even in the middle of a war in which the Jews are shedding their blood without stint, many Englishmen domiciled among them are mocking their most cherished institutions (such as the Monarchy), affirming that the war is not being fought for the preservation of "traditional Palestine" and taking a leading part in subversive movements which fill "traditional Jews" with detestation and horror.

Finally, for purposes of this short hypothesis, it cannot

be said that the English are generally liked, either by the Jews or by any other people in whose midst they have settled. Many of them do not go out of their way to be liked, especially those who adopt towards the land of their adoption a somewhat condescending air of proprietorship. So it comes about, in Palestine and elsewhere, that there is held to be an "English Problem".

Now is it possible to imagine such a state of affairs existing in a modern Jewish Palestine? I submit that it is not possible, for two main reasons. First, the English have many gifts, but among them one does not find that tremendous energy, concentration and ethnic solidarity which would enable them to establish such a special position among Jews. Second, the Jews themselves have many gifts, but among them one will search in vain for the patience which would allow them to tolerate any situation of the kind. Am I wrong in thinking that Palestine under such conditions would long ago have kicked the English out? Yet the converse of this situation exists to-day in Britain and throughout the world. The Jews have undoubtedly established just such a special position for themselves. The result is anti-semitism.

Anti-semitism, that is to say, is an effect and not a cause, and has to be recognized as such before one can even begin to talk about finding a solution to the problem. If the constant A invariably produces the constant B, no matter in what age or clime, then it seems to me that common-sense demands an investigation of A, whereas every Jewish apologist I have ever read fixes upon B and attacks it as an isolate. That method aggravates rather than diminishes the disease, but even so we should in fairness examine it to find out what validity, if any, it possesses.

In other words, we have to ask ourselves the question: Is anti-semitism a racket? Does the holder of anti-

semitic views derive any profit from them? If a man were running an exclusively anti-semitic journal, or earning a living as an official of some exclusively anti-semitic society, then I can conceive it possible that he might have a vested interest in the perpetuation of anti-semitism. But I do not know of any such journal or society. You may point out that a vested interest can be established outside the sphere of monetary gain, and that if anti-semitism were to be abolished (through the elimination of its causes) some men might find themselves robbed of their entire intellectual or politico-emotional stock-in-trade. Perhaps so, for there are cranks in every walk of life. Outside the ranks of Jewry, however, the anti-semitic crank is not taken seriously; rather is he treated as the harmless lunatic which in fact he is. For the rest, I ask you to accept my assurance that anti-semitism in Britain is a royal road leading—not to prosperity and fame—but more often to obloquy and ruin. The Jews see to that. I am able to illustrate the Jewish technique in this matter from my own experience. When, after three years voluntary active service in this war (making a total of seven years' voluntary active service in all) I returned to civil life, a deputation of Jews called upon my employer with the amiable suggestion that he should dismiss me from his service. I was not sufficiently interested in these people to enquire their names, but I did happen to learn that they had never taken any step, voluntary or otherwise, to place their own persons in the enemy's line of fire! But that is by the way.

I have said that the anti-semitic crank—the man with the one-track-mind—is nowhere taken seriously outside the ranks of Jewry, and this leads me to suggest that while non-Jews have nothing to gain from anti-semitism, it is just possible that the Jews themselves have much to gain from it. This suggestion may sound fantastic, but is it?

Many editors of Jewish newspapers, for instance, seem to be men of sound judgment. How does it come about, therefore, that even the obscurest of anti-semitic tub-thumpers in the obscurest of back streets is sure of publicity in these periodicals? Why do the editors range over the Press of the world in search of trifling anti-semitic paragraphs to reprint? What conceivable purpose is served by thus making Jewish newspapers virtual anti-semitic broad-sheets? I do not suggest that these things are done deliberately to build circulation, although it is possible that more Jews do buy copies because of the excitement occasioned by reading of anti-semitic outbursts. But would I be wrong if I were to suggest that a measure of anti-semitism, where there is the assurance that it will be properly controlled, does help to promote Jewish solidarity and therefore constitutes a strong counter to Jewish indifference and schism? In support of this idea—which is no more than an idea—I would like to ask your opinion about the following extract from a sermon published by the *Jewish Chronicle*:

“The greatest threat to the existence of the Jew, to the pursuance of his glorious destiny as the guardian of God’s law and the remembrancer of His principle for the advancement of man, lies not in the cruellest persecution, but in genuine tolerance and security.”

If my suspicions are unworthy you will tell me so. If not unworthy, it is possible that they may indicate one means, not, it is true, of eliminating anti-semitism, but of preventing it being deliberately fostered by short-sighted Jewish policies.

The main problem, however, is to tackle anti-semitism at the source, which can only be done, with submission, by enquiring into semitism. That is what most Jews

refuse to do. They angrily proclaim their grievances against the anti-semites but ignore the underlying grievances which are responsible for the rise of anti-semitism. I intend in subsequent chapters to specify some of these underlying grievances, in the hope that between us we may be able to adumbrate some solution. My own contention, in answer to the heading of the present chapter, is that anti-semitism in Britain is far too uncomfortable in its consequences to encourage any Gentiles to turn it into a racket, whereas I think it just possible that in some respects it may be a racket of the Jews themselves. Do you agree?

A.K.C.

## CHAPTER TWO

### The "Alien Slant"

MY DEAR CHESTERTON,

I accept of course all you say about your personal approach to this question of anti-semitism. Certainly I could not discuss such a question with anyone "beyond the reach of reason, justice and even of common decency". Yet there are many such among the anti-semites, and the extermination of millions of Jews in Europe for no other reason than that they were Jews, indicates that there is something diabolical in such hatred of any group of human beings lumped together as fit for nothing but slaughter, as though they had no individual souls. It is not necessary for me to add to all that has been said and written about the horrors of the Jewish massacres. I shall quote only two men, Winston Churchill who, speaking as Prime Minister, said: "The systematic cruelties to which the Jewish people—men, women and children—have been exposed under the Nazi régime are amongst the most terrible events of history, and place an indelible stain upon all who perpetrate and instigate them," and Viscount Simon, speaking as Lord Chancellor in the House of Lords debate on war criminals, who said: "The declaration stands of the author of *Mein Kampf* in reference to German Jews, who were his fellow-countrymen—'You may have shown for years past your strict support of the German State and acted with perfect loyalty to the German State', yet that did not save them against this abominable calculated prolonged campaign of atrocity against a set of people whose only crime was that they belonged to a particular race." We are not discussing a theoretical question, but the murder and torture of millions of my fellow-Jews. The word anti-semitism drips with blood.

Yet anti-semitism did not begin with Hitler nor with the modern anti-semitic movement. It goes right through history. Before Germany and England existed Haman planned to destroy all the Jews. The attempt was made even before that. In a few days we Jews will be celebrating the Passover in commemoration of the Exodus from Egypt. You know of course that it is the background of your own traditional English Easter, that the Last Supper was the Passover meal. I may return to this when I come to your complaints of Jewish influence on English life. I am now concerned with the oppression in Egypt, with the decree to kill all Jewish male children and to destroy the seed. It goes back a long way. And it runs like a continuous thread through the centuries, ever since Abraham came to know the One God and had to flee from his own land and from his father's house, because he refused to worship idols. I have deliberately brought in this note here, to differentiate from the outset our Jewish separateness from the separateness of the racialists. It may explain the persecution of the Jews better than the questionable "racial science" will, or "Semitism" will. But the point is the persisting anti-semitism. And this as I say did not begin with Hitler, and it is not, as the Marxists claim, purely economic, any more than it is racial. Esau was of the same "race" as Jacob, brothers born of the same father and mother.

I see that someone argues in a letter in the *Jewish Chronicle* that "the real cause of anti-semitism in the modern world is the need of German Fascism and its friends in every country to have an ideological weapon for diverting, confusing and degrading sections of the people". I am not blind to the evils of German Fascism, which have manifested themselves not only in the form of anti-semitism. It is not because of the sufferings of the Jews that the war was fought. And the massacres of the

middle ages, the Spanish Inquisition, the Chmelnicky pogroms and the Russian pogroms of later days show that anti-semitism goes back much further than German Fascism. It is not a new appearance even in modern times. Anti-semitism was prevalent in Germany before Hitler, it existed in England before Mosley, and it is widespread to-day in America. It is a factor in our life, and it is Professor Brodetsky, the President of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, who is reported in the *Jewish Chronicle* to have said: "He was in strong agreement with the statement made in the leader in the *Jewish Chronicle* that they ought to approach the problem of anti-semitism by finding out much more about it than they knew. They ought to think not only of the immediate anti-semitism, but far more of the anti-semitism likely to come."

I once spoke on the same platform at a P.E.N. meeting with Hermon Ould, the International Secretary of the P.E.N., when he made the proposal that "an international commission should be set up as soon as possible to study the causes of anti-semitism and suggest a cure for a disease which has lasted two thousand years". The *Jewish Chronicle* editorially supported the proposal, urging that it should not be thrown aside "under the delusion that anti-semitism is a figment". "Some time ago", it returned to the subject in a later editorial, "a strong plea was made in these columns for setting up a committee of experts in the political, sociological, economic, psychological and other fields who would apply their specialist knowledge and ability to a scientific objective analysis of the anti-semitic phenomenon and get down to the roots of the disease. In the meantime the community drifts in a hopelessly muddled atmosphere of doubts, fears and illusions. Some manage to persuade themselves in between the flagrant manifestations that there is no anti-semitism, despite the fact that thoughtful and observant



Gentiles are constantly led to conclusions such as that which the distinguished author, Mr. Shaw Desmond, expressed in our columns last week: 'anti-semitism is growing with hideous intensity in this island—for instance, amongst certain sections of the Forces, a phenomenon of immediate vital import to all Jews.'” At the same time a correspondent in the *Jewish Chronicle* questions whether a committee of experts can discover anything new about “the reasons for anti-semitism—pre-Christian in origin—after the innumerable works on every aspect of the subject”.

Now I am not a scientist. I am no expert in the political, sociological, economic or psychological fields, and I can make no “scientific objective analysis of the anti-semitic phenomenon”. I am a Jew, and Judaism is my first loyalty (in the sense in which Christianity is or should be a Christian's first loyalty) and I cannot be scientifically objective about a movement which aims to destroy me and my fellow-Jews and to wipe Judaism as a spiritual force off the face of the earth. Nor can I pretend to have the right to speak for all Jews and say that what I am writing is going to be approved by them all. There is no legend so devoid of all foundation as that of Jewish unanimity. I know what is going on in Jewish community life in this country. “We are dissipating our energies in disputes over various matters concerning the Jewish community; we are failing to pay any attention to the fact that the community itself is facing disaster”, Dr. Cecil Roth has written.

You warned me in one of your preliminary letters that if I fall in with your proposal to write this book I shall “most certainly be accused of being used for the purpose of anti-semitic propaganda,” though that, you assured me, is “far from being my intention; and conversely”, you wrote about yourself, “I shall be accused by the other side of playing into the hands of the Jews.”

Well, I am not a frightened Jew, and if I have not the right to say what I believe, I might as well be living in a totalitarian State. And there is one other thing I am not. Professor Roback, who knows me fairly well, has a reference to me in one of his books: "For Mr. Marmor's benefit it may be said that Mr. Leftwich is anything but apologetic, in whatever sense the word is taken. I fear", he proceeds, "that the apologist's cap fits those who are afraid to broach such matters openly, who adopt a hush-hush policy." Exactly. You will not find me an apologetic Jew. You will not find me trying to persuade you that all Jews are unoffending victims of prejudice and that there is nothing wrong with us.

I am in good company in that respect. The *Jewish Chronicle* has written in an editorial: "Of course, being human, many Jews have faults." And Dr. Cecil Roth has declared that "he was in slight disagreement with some other followers of the profession of Jewish history who had built up an idealist picture of the Jew. To his mind that was particularly dangerous. Historians must present a full and accurate picture. The result of suppression was that their enemies said: 'look how the Jews write their history!' He himself was making a point of referring to misdeeds by Jews in the past."

The Jewish question is so much discussed that almost every Jew has become vocal about it, and it does not follow that everything which even a good honest Jew says will necessarily find acceptance with all Jews. I have found a good many things I have said before vigorously disputed by other Jews whose claim to be Jewish spokesmen is greater than mine, though we have no such thing as a Jewish Pope. I have seen too much of the tendency to fasten on some crack-pot idiocy pronounced by an obscure or even a highly-placed Jew, or by a Jewish body with a high-sounding name, and treat it as though it were

part of the Law given on Sinai. I am not trying to evade responsibility for anything I am saying, but I speak purely in my personal capacity. I think you would dispute very strongly the right of even some properly elected members of Parliament to speak for you. There are differences within every group, very vital differences.

I realize, too, as Dr. James Parkes puts it, that "there are many who would be considered by the Jews 'anti-semitic' who have deep ethical and cultural reasons for their attitude. They may be wrong in their method of action, but no approach to the question is likely to prepare a lasting result which does not recognize that there are real values at issue on both sides, and that the non-Jew is often anxious to protect something which is as precious to himself as are his rights and liberty to a Jew."

You tell me that you are an anti-semite because you are a nationalist, because you believe that every nation has its guiding star, its own ideal pattern which it must endeavour to trace, its own distinctive character, its own soul, and the Jew, good or bad as an individual cannot fit in with any other national ideal except his own, so that he is in the life of every other nation an alien influence, distorting the national ideal and hostile to it.

It is the theme of Belloc's book *The Jews*, which was published in 1922. I reviewed it at the time in a number of Jewish papers, including a prominent Zionist monthly, where I pointed out how close the thesis is to Zionist thought. Belloc's friend and colleague, G. K. Chesterton, used to describe himself as a frustrated Zionist. I have found him writing as early as 1911: "I am not an anti-semite. I am a Zionist. Zionism I believe to be the right line, and Jews who are anxious to see the Jewish question solved should do their utmost to shunt it on that line." Belloc too indicates that what he would like would be a thorough-going Zionism, with a Jewish State, where the

whole or the great mass of the Jewish people would reside, and the friction between Jew and Gentile would in that way be removed. Would you support such a thorough-going Zionism? Or at least, since I don't expect you to devote yourself to other people's interests, would you not hinder and oppose such an effort towards Jewish normalization?

There is an interesting point about your belief in a special guiding star for every nation, because the ancient Rabbis held that each nation is placed under the protection of a special angel.

Do you know that Herzl, the founder of the modern Zionist movement, proposed in his little book *The Jewish State*, which laid the basis of the Zionist movement, that there should be a Jewish exodus from Europe to the Jewish State? "There will be an inner migration of Christian citizens into the positions vacated by Jews", he wrote. "The outgoing current will be gradual, without any disturbance, and its initial movement will put an end to anti-semitism." "I believe I understand anti-semitism, which is really a highly complex movement", Herzl went on. "I consider it from a Jewish standpoint, yet without fear or hatred. It is a national question, which can only be solved by making it a political world question to be discussed and settled by the civilized nations of the world in council."

Leon Pinsker, whose *Auto-emancipation* preceded Herzl, wrote there: "As the Jew is nowhere at home, is nowhere considered a native, he remains everywhere a stranger. The fact that he and his forefathers have been born in the country does not alter this fact in the least. Mostly he is treated as a step-child, a cinderella, at best he is accepted as an adopted child, whose rights may be contested, never as a legitimate child of the Fatherland. The German, the Slav, the Celt do not agree that the Semitic Jew is their equal by birth."

Achad Ha'am, the father of spiritual Zionism, has written: "For eighteen centuries the homeless Jew has been the butt of hatred and oppression, has been seaman on board every ship of State but his own, has been made the huckster of the world's spiritual and material goods, has been alternately master in the narrow ghetto and slave in the larger world of an alien culture, has been driven from the soil and the sun into the soul-withering atmosphere of the counting house—has been forced to live every life imaginable except that of his own individuality. What the Jew needs is a soil of his own, a fixed centre for his national life. And that centre can be found only in the land with which the history of the Jews is inevitably bound up. Only in Palestine can the Jew become once more a Hebrew."

Martin Buber, a German Jewish exponent of spiritual Zionism, once published a little dialogue between a Jewish teacher and his Jewish pupil, in which the teacher gets the boy to admit that "things German are not actually part of him". He "lacks something", the teacher explains to him, "which would enable him to live in the German spirit automatically".

I think that this is from the other side the idea you are trying to convey.

Dr. Weizmann, the Zionist leader, has told us that "Switzerland is a small country, and there are more Swiss outside Switzerland than in it. But there is no such thing as anti-Swiss sentiment in the sense there is anti-Jewish sentiment. The Swiss has a home of his own to which he can retreat, to which he can invite others."

Jabotinsky, the leader of the Zionist-Revisionists, formulated "Jewish evacuation" as part of his Party's programme. "The great advantage of the word 'evacuation' is its implied suggestion of organized orderliness", he wrote. "'Emigration' has always meant a haphazard

scramble, 'exodus' inevitably recalls the pursuing enemy host. Mass evacuation is the only remedy."

Israel Zangwill pointed out that Lord Balfour's support of Zionism was based on a desire to provide the Jews with a home in Palestine as "a serious endeavour to mitigate the age-long miseries created for Western civilization by the presence in its midst of a Body which it too long regarded as alien and even hostile, but which it was equally unable to expel or absorb."

Even your attempt to picture the situation reversed, the English living as a minority in a powerful Jewish Imperial Palestine, has been in a way anticipated by Professor Namier, in his book *Conflicts*. "If only the Jews could for once grow so big, be so firmly rooted in the soil, feel so perfectly at ease, and the non-Jews find themselves by some miracle, circumstanced as the Jews are at present! The decent Jews would then befriend them, and occasionally lecture them in a kindly manner, and the nasty ones would indulge in spiteful criticism; and together they would, having become 'Gentile-conscious' analyse 'Gentile peculiarities' and discuss 'the Gentile problem'." "What a life," he exclaims, "to be continually on trial and under examination. Uncertainty breeds anxiety, and anxiety provokes critical attention. Even if there is no open hostility, there is a more than ordinary readiness to find fault. Prejudice is the universal attitude of men towards strangers not strong enough to command their respect and approval."

There are many Jews who will agree with you entirely about the desirability of the Jews going out of Europe to live in a land of their own, in a thoroughly Jewish atmosphere. "There are some Jews," writes Captain Halpern, "who are bound to other Jews only by the ties of religion, and there are those who like myself consider themselves Jews as Englishmen consider themselves English."

Do you know that there are Jews who are sickened by the constant conflict with an alien world? There is a Jewish poet, Glatstein, who speaks for many of them when he exclaims:

“Good night, big world, great big stinking world.

Not you, but I bang the door and break off the latch.

With a long gaberdine, with a flaming yellow patch,

With proud step and mien, at my own command I go

Back to the Ghetto.

I go back from Wagner’s heathen music to my own Biblical chant.”

A Zionist theoretician, Dr. Klatzkin, has actually formulated it in this way: “Recognition as an alien body, even if it should imply the deprivation of citizen rights. Loyalty to our own, and dissociation from the alien, even to a self-imposed ghetto. As an alien body, we claim a separate status, with all its advantages and disadvantages. We respect the right of the State-Nation to have its national individuality protected against those who are alien to the nation.” Dr. Zollschan, himself an old Zionist, who quotes this in his pamphlet against *The Dogmatism of Jewish Nationalism* has something further to say which will interest you in connection with your implied demand that Jews should not take part in the political life of the country. He speaks of a Zionist postulate that Jews should take no interest in the political affairs of the countries they live in, and he instances Herzl’s demand that Zadock Kahn and Narcisse Leven, French Jews, must identify themselves either with French or with Jewish interests, not with both. Dr. Nathan Birnbaum, who is credited with having first used the word “Zionism” has written of the early Zionists that “they did not waste a word of anger or explanation on the anti-semites. They directed their attention to their own brethren. They deprecated the interference of Jews in the political life of

the nations." I have been told that when Joseph Cowen wanted to stand for Parliament, Herzl dissuaded him on the ground that a Zionist should not interfere in British politics.

Max Brod, the novelist, who is a Zionist and lives in Palestine, urges Jews not to take any active part in the political life of other people. "What would have happened", he asked, "had Leon Blum still been Premier of France when Czechoslovakia was abandoned, or when France declared war against Germany? It is dangerous for Jews to direct the policies of other peoples." Stefan Zweig, who wasn't a Zionist, came to the same conclusion: "We must not allow ourselves to be thrust out of general life", he wrote, "but it is dangerous for Jews to play a leading part in politics. According to the principles of justice and equality a Jew has the same right as any other citizen to hold first place in the life of the State. But a Jew has a thousand times more responsibility. Think of the troubles we have had because of Jews who have pushed themselves into leading positions in various countries. As things are now a Jew can best serve his cause in the ranks, not strive to lead it." But if Jews acted on this advice, would they not be accused of shirking their responsibilities of citizenship, and those of them who have gifts of political leadership, of denying them to the State? Would they be allowed to live in a country which they would refuse to serve with all they can?

You say that every true man wants a country of his own, but non-Zionist Jews are an exception. Are they? It depends on what you mean by a man's country. Where do I and others like me belong?

I quote from an article I published in 1943 in *The Jewish Bulletin*: "I am a Londoner. London is my home and the centre of my world. Most of my fifty years of life have been spent in London, and whenever I have come



back to it from abroad I have wondered 'having left at home my heart, how I lived so long from it apart'. Its streets are to me full of memories, reaching back through early youth to schooldays and childhood. Here my parents lived and died and are buried. Here I grew to manhood and middle age, and whatever future I envisage for myself and mine inevitably has London as its centre and background. I have grown to be part of it. All that I am includes, flesh and bone, mind and spirit, something that is London. In those far off days when Queen Victoria still reigned, we Jewish children in Whitechapel grew up, as I did, as Esther Ansell, in Zangwill's 'Children of the Ghetto' did, with 'the knowledge that she was a Jewish girl, but far more vividly she realized that she was an English girl. Esther absorbed these ideas from the school reading books. The experience of a month will overlay the hereditary bequest of a century.' Esther Ansell is the prototype of us all. For in the land where we live are all our associations and what, apart from associations have we in life; what different people with different associations we would have been."

I took up just now Edward Thomas's essay "England", and I find him writing there: "While I was trying to learn from other people what they meant by 'England' and 'my country', I went to a friend who knows his England and is not ignorant of Europe. I did not say 'Why do you love your country?' but I must have used words to that effect. I wanted to know what he felt. He said: 'Reasons why I love England? Do I love England? If I prefer England I expect it is merely that I am accustomed to it, that my material welfare is bound up more or less with that of the whole country, that the greater number of beautiful sensations I have enjoyed are associated with its scenery and its people. These reasons would hold good for any other country if I had chanced

to be born elsewhere'. ('He carelessly forgot', Edward Thomas comments, 'that if he had been born somewhere else he would have been a different person.') 'In any case, these reasons are not sufficient to make me conscious of my active love of England, in the sense that it would be impossible for me to be quite as happy in any other country—excepting always the loss of old associations.' ('He forgot to consider', Edward Thomas comments again, 'how much he possessed apart from associations')."

Can you shake off the associations of a lifetime? Arnold Zweig who went to Palestine from Germany has recorded his feeling in his book *De Vriendt Goes Home*: "We know how deeply our native countries have stamped us," says his Palestine engineer Saamen. "You think German and of German Jews. I think Russian and of Russian Jews." And Dr. Klopfer of the Hebrew University, nods with a shocked air. "It was rightly observed and rightly spoken. The distinction between German, Austrian, Russian and British Jews could be felt too in Jerusalem, and lasted until the grave."

I suppose you would not agree with H. G. Wells that if all the babies of one country were exchanged at birth for those of another they would grow up completely part of their land of education. But it seems to be the view of English law. The Master of the Rolls giving judgment in 1945 in a child custody case, where the mother wished to take a boy of seven to Czechoslovakia, having married a Czechoslovakian officer, said that if this were done the boy might be completely absorbed into the Czech way of life and lose all connection with the country of his birth.

You suggest that no one can be English and live according to the continuing traditions of England if he is not of native English stock, and that all this attachment we Jews here feel has at best unconsciously an alien slant.

What is an alien slant? Is the English or the Jewish

character or any other in this modern world, recognizable as it is, something inborn and bound to develop in that precise way under whatever conditions and upbringing? Or is it the result of training, of atmosphere, of the land and language, the geography of the country, the common interests of all who live in the same land, and of innumerable cross-influences, and constantly growing and developing? Was English character always the same? How much other influence, not only Jewish, has come into it and shaped it? When you speak of Jewish alien influence do you realize how far back it goes and that the Jews did not bring it to England, but St. Augustine with his Christianity? How entirely different would English life and language have been (Celtic and Anglo-Saxon and Danish and Norman—and the Romans had been here before and had made this island a Roman land for four centuries) had England remained a pagan land and not become Christian. What different images and ideals and mythology. King Arthur of the Round Table sought the San Grail, which had something to do with a man who died in Jerusalem. King Alfred modelled his laws on those of Moses. Richard Cœur de Lion went to fight for a tomb in Palestine. It was the word of the Hebrew Scriptures that shaped English literature from Chaucer to Shakespeare and Milton and Bunyan and to the writers of our own day. It was the Bible that inspired English customs and institutions, and led her champions of the people and of the ways of the English people from John Ball and Wycliffe to Hampden and Cromwell. No Jewish "aliens" "corrupting" the true English spirit were behind those older English risings, but the word of the Hebrew Scriptures moved Englishmen to strive for justice and to overthrow wrong.

"Without the English Bible", writes Ford Madox Ford, "how should we have to-day any English prose, or any

English frame of mind?" "Our way of looking at life and at things, our maxims of conduct, our ideals of feeling would obviously be something widely unlike those which we now entertain," Professor Tucker reminds us in his book, *The Foreign Debt of English Literature*. "In a sense the Hebrews have determined our literature more than all other influences combined. The English heart and mind are now partly made of Hebrew thought and ideals. To other literatures we have looked for models to imitate and motives to borrow. To the Biblical literature we have looked for a transfusion of all our thinking."

Even of the language, Professor Meillet has written: "It is hard to imagine what would be, without the Bible, the English tongue to-day."

The idea of a nation which is pure by blood and uncorrupted by outside influences is possible only among savages, among closed communities that refuse to accept the outside world and its advantages. After all, whatever we are we are human beings, and nothing human is alien to us.

According to Bagehot civilization is the result of the competition between the different nations. That explains "why the 'protected' regions of the world," he tells us, "the interior of continents like Africa, outlying islands like Australia or New Zealand are of necessity backward." "And it explains why Western Europe was early in advance of other countries, because there the contest of races was exceedingly severe." He has something to say too of the dislike which old governments had to trade, regarding it as the source of corruption, and he quotes on this point Dr. Arnold, "speaking ironically"—"Well, indeed, might the policy of the old priest-nobles of Egypt and India endeavour to divert their people from becoming familiar with the sea and represent the occupation of a seaman as incompatible with the purity of the highest

castes. The sea deserved to be hated by the old aristocracies, inasmuch as it had been the mightiest instrument in the civilization of mankind."

Nor, with all this talk of "Jewish influence", must you suppose that the Jews and Judaism escaped being influenced by others, any more than the rest of the world. Jewish contacts through the centuries with Egypt, Babylon, Persia, Greece, Rome, Spain, Germany, Poland, Russia, England and America, with Moslem and Christian, have shaped and influenced Jewish thought and character. It would need a chapter to itself to deal even briefly with this constant influencing and growth of Jewish thought. I will take only two examples, Aristotelian influence on the philosophy of two of the greatest teachers of Judaism, Saadia in the tenth century and Maimonides in the twelfth. To come to our own time, there is a great and very brave Rabbi, Dr. Leo Baeck, who was the head of the German Jewish community, and as such came frequently to this country, where he could have stayed, but always went back to lead and help his flock. He was finally sent to Terezin and was fortunate enough to survive and be set free by the liberation. Dr. Claude Montefiore some years ago reviewed his contribution on "Judaism" to a volume called *The Religions of the World*, and he made this very interesting observation: "The effect of Christianity, and of Christian philosophy and theology upon Dr. Baeck is highly curious and interesting. Baeck's Judaism is inconceivable without Christianity. Christian philosophers, Kant perhaps most of all, but probably Hegel too have gone to its making—unconscious absorption on the one hand, unconscious and conscious opposition on the other."

I am not going to trace here the way in which "foreign" ideas made our present-day Europe. But culture and civilization have always been the result of cross-fertiliza-

tion. And these cross-influences have so worked their way into all our lives that if we try to disentangle them all our civilization may fall apart. There is something of everything in us all.

I see that M. Nicolas in his book *From Nietzsche Down to Hitler* insists on the "Jewish origin" of Hitlerism. "Behind *Mein Kampf*", he writes, "there is not one of Nietzsche's books, but there are a few from the Old Testament." It is the theme of Dr. Oscar Levy, whom Desmond MacCarthy described as "the ablest and most original of Nietzscheans". To him Hitlerism and anti-semitism in Germany were "the result of the disastrous capture of German mentality by the Old Testament". This is the Dr. Oscar Levy who found his way as a "Jewish witness against the Jews" into that hotch-potch of anti-semitism published by Arnold Leese, of the "Imperial Fascist League" which advertised itself as "having no connection with Sir Oswald Mosley's Pro-Jewish Organization". The *Jewish Chronicle* of course objected to this "tendency nowadays to describe the racialism of Hitler as really a Jewish doctrine. There is no truth", it declared, "in this charge, so terribly grave in existing conditions. Against it need only be set the Jewish law of equality for the stranger and the inborn or the fine and lofty principles enunciated by the Jewish sages, e.g. as that the pious of all nations have their portion in the world to come."

The charge was made against the Jews before Hitler, and in the first war Zangwill had to deal with it. "The recent revelation of racial arrogance in Germany has provided our enemies with a new weapon", he wrote. "'Germanism is Judaism' says a writer in the *American Bookman*. 'As the Kaiser talks to-day at Potsdam and Berlin', says Verhaeren, 'the Kings of Israel and their Prophets talked six thousand years ago at Jerusalem.'" Zangwill's answer was that it showed the absurdity of

judging the Bible outside its historic conditions, or by standards not comparative. "If Germanism resembles Judaism", he suggested, "it is as a monkey resembles a man. If I were asked to sum up in a word the essential difference between Judaism and Germanism, it would be the word 'Recessional'. While the Prophets and historians of Germany monotonously glorify their nation, the Jewish writers as monotonously rebuke theirs. The Bible is an anti-semitic book. Jewish literature unflinchingly exposes the flaws even of a Moses and a David."

That prophetic self-castigation of which Zangwill speaks is not the spirit which animated some anti-semites of Jewish birth to contribute towards the growth of German anti-semitism and its culmination in Hitlerism. Nor were Jews the only renegades. Houston Chamberlain was an Englishman who was rabidly anti-English. But it shows how "Jewish" even anti-semitism is when we find that the actual founder of the German anti-semitic movement, the man who coined the very word anti-semitism was Wilhelm Marr, who was born a Jew, and had adopted Christianity. He started the Anti-semitic League in Berlin in 1879. Otto Weininger, who committed suicide in 1903, was another Jewish-born Jew-hater, whose works were used by the German anti-semites for their propaganda. And Theodor Fritsch, the Leipzig anti-semite whom Hitler called his teacher in anti-semitism, published the anti-semitic writings of the "Jew" Arthur Trebitsch, and (in 1929) defended his association with Trebitsch on the ground that "his evidence against the Jews is of inestimable value because it comes from one who is himself of Jewish origin. In his zealous concern for the future of the German nation", he added, "many a good German might take an example from him."

And since my contention is that what differentiates the Jew from his neighbour is not the difference between the

Jew and the Englishman or the Frenchman but the difference between the Jew and the Christian, I think I should remind you that the same things as are being said about the Jews in Christian Europe were said about the Christians in the old pagan Europe. "Despite the peaceable harmless lives of its adherents, the Christians for nearly three centuries after the death of their founder were subjected to terrible persecution," writes Professor Webster in his *History of the Ancient World*. "All sorts of disasters were believed to be caused by them. It was not difficult to excite the vicious crowds of the large cities to riots and disorders in which many followers of the new religion suffered wounds and death. As a Christian writer said, 'If the Tiber rises, if the Nile does not rise, if the heavens give no rain, if there is an earthquake, famine or pestilence, straightway the cry is "The Christians to the lions!"' "

J.L.



## CHAPTER THREE

### Standing Forth as Jews

MY DEAR CHESTERTON,

You threw out so many lines in your first letter that I have not been able in one letter to catch up with all your questions. You ask me for instance whether I consider anti-semitism a racket, in the sense of providing profit for one holding anti-semitic views. Well, Nazi Germany seems to provide the answer. Hitler and Goebbels and the rest rose to power by blaming the Jews for everything that was wrong in Germany. And what were the Jews, with all "the colossal world financial power" which you allege we possess, able to do against it? Had Hitler not gone on to aggression against Poland and threatened France and Britain he would, I am sure, still be safely in power to-day, untroubled by anything the Jews could do. "On 3rd September, 1939", Sir Ernest Benn wrote, "this Nation, with one voice and heart, declared war on Nazi aggression. No other thought was in its mind."

And the experience of Mosleyite anti-semitism, till the war, not the Jews, stopped it, showed what a powerful anti-semitic campaign can be worked up even here. Your own charges that the Jews through their "colossal world financial power, intimately related to political power" are "the masters of mankind", and operate that power in the interests of "Jewish internationalism" at the expense of British national interests and to the "sole advantage of the money-racket" certainly suggest an easy way of working up prejudice on grounds that have no foundation. I am not one of those who believe in trying to minimise the part Jews play in the various branches of human activity, and pretending that we are an unimportant factor that doesn't deserve attention. What good is the spirit of

Judaism if it does not mean anything to the world, if it might just as well not be there? And what purpose would it serve to continue as Jews if we might as well not exist as such? The attempts to show that Jews don't do anything seem to me as stupid as the other extreme, of parading the names of great Jews and telling the world what "we" have done for it.

I know that there are Jews in big financial concerns, and if they dominated them all I would face the fact. But while I hold no brief for financiers, Jewish or otherwise, I know that the City of London and Wall Street are by no means exclusively or even dominantly Jewish; and if their operations are harmful the proper course is for the Government to put down these financial interests. I shall not ask that Jewish financiers should be spared and only the others proceeded against.

Nor do I think what you say about Jewish commercial ability takes account of the great belief the world has in English commercial ability, a belief which most English people share. Wasn't it trade that built the Empire? "The part taken by the various trading companies and chartered corporations in the development of the British Empire is so important. . . ." I read in *The British Empire* series, which grew out of the 1924 British Empire Exhibition. I have no gift for commerce or finance, and I am aware of their ugly aspects. But it wasn't Jews Ruskin had in mind when he denounced the "perpetual plague of sulphurous darkness" of the English manufacturing towns. I seem to remember quite a lot being said about the commercial morality of businessmen in general, whether they were English or American, German, French, Calvinist, Presbyterian or what you will, and if some Jewish businessmen are no better it is because they are businessmen, not because they are Jews.

The old slave-traders Wilberforce fought were not Jews,

nor were the ship-owners who sent out unseaworthy ships, overloaded and over-insured, and against whom Plimsoll had to wage the battle which brought the Plimsoll line. Bottomley and Hooley and Jabez Balfour were not Jews, and the South Sea Bubble wasn't a Jewish ramp. The Old Bailey wasn't built for Jews. And if we talk of shady solicitors the image evoked is that of Dickens's Dodson and Fogg, whose claws, he afterwards told us, legal reforms have pared. By the way, Dr. Crookshank, in his book *The Mongol in Our Midst* sees the danger not in the Jews but in the Mongoloid type. "A criminal doctor, a bankrupt parson or a more than commonly knavish solicitor is not infrequently of this class," he tells us. The problem of human delinquency is not a Jewish problem. It cuts across all group divisions of race, colour and creed. Avarice, envy, hatred, treachery and all the unlovely qualities are found in every branch of mankind. And Swift when he satirized them made no distinction between Jew and Gentile. He contrasted the human animal as a whole unfavourably with the horse. It is the mission of religion to insist that man despite his faults is higher than the brute, to insist on the Godlike in man. And here Judaism does not claim the merit for Jews, but concedes it to the "righteous of all creeds".

You don't accuse us of controlling the Press, because the Press lords are too obviously not Jewish, (Lord Southwood, the only one who was born a Jew died a Christian) and Jews are little in evidence in Fleet Street, but you suggest that by virtue of our "advertising leverage" we manage to keep all discussion of our malpractices out of the British Press and the British Broadcasting programmes. I seem to remember a good deal of Jewish concern at the way in which Jewish black market offenders were reported in the Press in such a way as to suggest that this was almost exclusively a Jewish offence. The Mayor of

Stepney, Alderman Pritchard, speaking as a member of the Stepney Food Control Committee, declared that "considering our big Jewish population the number of proceedings against or the offences committed by Jewish traders is very small." I have no idea what proportion of black market offenders are Jews, but if there is to be punishment they should all be punished, Jews and non-Jews alike. We Jews don't want to shield our offenders.

Sometimes in fact we rouse dissatisfaction because we speak out too strongly against our black sheep. I remember a complaint made in a letter to the *Jewish Chronicle* against the Chief Rabbi's "repeated references in public utterances to Jewish participation in black market offences". "The heads of the Protestant, Catholic and other denominations", the writer urged, "did not deem it necessary to refer to the black marketeers in their ranks or to ask them as Protestants, Catholics, etc. to cease their activities. It is really the Government who should appeal to all citizens (and not to a section or a particular creed) to refrain from these malpractices."

"This paper", the *Jewish Chronicle* has written editorially, "remorselessly castigates those Jews whose behaviour either in point of morality or consideration for others disgraces the fine traditions of Jewish conduct." In another editorial the *Jewish Chronicle* went even further. "There have been as in other sections of the population a few in our community—Jews rather in name than in spirit—who have descended to base behaviour inimical to the national interests. It is difficult to write of such renegades in language of moderation. There is certainly no reason why their co-religionists should not ostracize them." There was a time when the *Jewish Chronicle* made a point of specially reporting proceedings against Jewish offenders, as a kind of pillory. The *Jewish World* ran a special column of Law Reports confined to Jewish

offenders. Writing in 1893 Herzl urged that a newspaper "must not overlook, be silent about what Jews do that is wrong. If there is a lot of it, the worse for the Jews."

"Coarsened by high living, lack of exercise or the intermarriage of uncouth money-bags the Jewish type can be unlovely enough," Zangwill wrote. "The prosperous Jew who has shaken off the culture of the Ghetto and has not taken on modern culture is one of the most disagreeable types our planet has produced." You will not find us trying to claim that there is nothing wrong with any Jew, that because a man is a Jew he must be immune from criticism and left unpunished whatever he does. I turn back the pages of the *Jewish Chronicle* and I find an article in one of the 1935 issues, backing up something I had written in its columns a little earlier. "'Our enemies', Mr. Leftwich writes, 'know and proclaim that there are dregs in Jewish life—as in any other. It is ostrich-like to slur over a manifest fact'. It is impossible to deny the force of this contention. If we ignore such evils shall we not offer critics the dangerous argument that Jews wink at Jewish wrong-doing and take no steps to correct it?"

But the dregs and the wrong-doers are not the whole story. "Who on earth, save the lunatics", you write to me, "ever supposed that Jewry does not handsomely contribute to a wicked world its quota of noble souls!" That is something altogether different from the anti-semite's wholesale condemnation of all Jews. But "the countless noble Jews in every age and clime do not seem able to reach down to the popular consciousness," said Zangwill. "Barney Barnato is a proverb, while the quiet, dignified Jew passes practically unnoticed. The showy, flaunting, vaunting type attracts attention, but unless the Jew shrieks 'Walk up! Walk up! Behold in me the most

dignified man in Creation' his quiet dignity must go unregarded."

Jewry does indeed handsomely contribute to a wicked world its quota of noble souls. But they must be inspired by Judaism. I quoted just now the *Jewish Chronicle* castigating Jews guilty of malpractices because they "disgrace the fine traditions of Jewish conduct". It is a point to remember. For the Jew who lives according to the teachings of Judaism is not so likely to besmirch its name. "Every time one of us sins", the author of *The Spirit of Judaism* has written, "he profanes the Name. Every deception in deed or word, every sordid act, every departure from the standard of seemingly living that prevails among our neighbours besmirches the fair name of Israel. It drags the good name of Judaism through the mire." No good Jew will do that. And the remedy is not less but more Jewishness. It is not to be found in "racial Jewishness", which you accept, for that takes into account only birth, not Jewish observance. And while a non-observant Jew may be a very fine character, neither he nor the less pleasant type of "racial Jew" should be judged as a son of Judaism. They are "inertial Jews" as Waldo Frank calls them, "and the inertial Jews", he has written, "stink". I have just read an interview with a famous painter of Jewish origin. "Of course we were not religious at home," he said. "If you ask me what my Jewishness consists of, I'll be frank and will answer: 'I do not know' ". I understand that Jews ought to be proud of having him as a fellow-Jew. He appears to be a very fine man, and a great artist. But how is he a Jew?

I am tired of having it trotted out every time that this or the other great man is a Jew, when actually he has nothing to do with what we mean by Judaism and Jewishness. Freud realized it when he refused to take any leading part in Jewish life. He was not really a Jew, he

said. How could he have been, who spoke of the God of Israel as the Demon God of the Desert, just as Hitler's Chief of Pagan Germanism, Alfred Rosenberg, did? Or Bergson, whose philosophy was Catholic, and whose inclination was to be received into the Catholic Church, to which he spiritually belonged. It is an absurdity, this confusion of "Jewish blood" with Jewishness. A Christian clergyman writing in a London newspaper declares that when people talk about a man being a good Christian without going to church, it is nonsense. What is meant, he says, is "that you could be a decent citizen without ever going to church. But how can one be a good Christian and ignore completely the example and express commands of the Master? There is not a Christian sect, from Roman Catholic to Plymouth Brother which has not insisted always that its loyal members should go to church."

So it is good to see that the Beth Din, the highest Jewish authority in this country, has issued a solemn pronouncement that the children of intermarriages where the non-Jewish wife has not been admitted into the Jewish Faith are not Jewish.

You notice of course that the reference is only to the non-Jewish wife who has *not* been admitted to the Jewish faith. It is a matter not of birth and race but of religious belief. "This pronouncement has been a very necessary step in protecting the community from Jewish religious disintegration," the *Jewish Chronicle* comments in its editorial.

Jews are not alone in being "intolerant" about mixed marriage. I have lying in front of me a pamphlet on "Matrimony" written by a Jesuit Priest, with an official Archiepiscopal stamp of approval and the Theological Censor's mark, in which I find the following:

"The advice of the Church is, i. On no account choose

a Protestant. 2. Choose a Catholic. 3. Choose a good and virtuous Catholic. The Church is very severe in its condemnation of 'mixed marriages'. The choice of life's partner is too serious a step to be frivolously taken, for on it depends to a great extent the happiness of the future, both in this world and even in the next."

This brings me to an important point in the examination of anti-semitism. The subject inevitably leads to a discussion of unpleasant types, unlikeable Jews and disliked Jews and Jews who do not fit in (but unlikeable and disliked people and misfits are by no means only Jews) and they it seems to me belong rather to the pathology of the Jewish question. The majority of Jews are none of these things, but ordinary human beings. And normally the ordinary person does not even think of anti-semitism in connection with them. I have myself for instance never encountered personal anti-semitism. It is true, as my wife reminds me, that most of my life I have worked for Jewish papers and Jewish organizations, so that while I had and have a good many non-Jewish friends I have had no Jewish-non-Jewish economic problem. But my experience is not unique. There are many people who work with Jews, or employ Jews, or are employed by Jews who get on as well with them as with anybody else. I should imagine that foolish though it would be to shut our eyes to anti-semitism, philo-semitism in this country is at least as large. How many of the forty five million people in Great Britain are anti-semites?

It is an over-simplifying of the problem to regard what is going on as a Jewish question. Society is more complex than that. We have all sorts of clashes and antagonisms and temperamental differences among the people of every country and every group, which cannot be explained by the presence of an "alien" Jewish minority, for they have existed equally when there were no Jews in the country.



Jews had nothing to do with the downfall of the Stuarts, and little with the emergence of the Whig plutocracy in place of the old Tory landed aristocracy. Yet that was a very definite development in English life which has left deep marks in English history and English character. The whole evolution of bourgeois society, liberal and conservative, would have proceeded in the same way had there been no Jews in England, and English trade unionism, radicalism and the socialism inspired by Robert Owen, Keir Hardie and the Webbs, and even the Communism of Pollit and Gallagher are native British movements, like the Chartism which paved their way.

There are Jews who belong by self-interest or by temperament to one trend and there are Jews who by temperament or self-interest belong to the other. It is a clash between human ideas and not between Jewish and English character. This whole question of the Jews—"Have they souls or have they not souls? Some savages say they have none. Others, on the contrary, maintain that they are half divine and worship them." Only it is not Jews, but women that Virginia Woolf is writing about in this passage from *A Room of One's Own*. Women too, she tells us, are suddenly surprised to find themselves outside civilization, "alien and critical". I wonder if we should not apply to our subject—Jew and non-Jew—her conclusion about the sexes: "Life for both—and I looked at them shouldering their way along the pavement—is arduous, difficult, a perpetual struggle. It calls for gigantic courage and strength."

And now I want to ask you something. Precisely what English qualities made Houston Chamberlain not only an anti-semite but a renegade to England, and led along the same road the sons of two such fine Englishmen as Colonel Amery and the late Mr. Hewitt, K.C.? What was it the Judge said when he sentenced Hewitt? "When you

thought your native land and your adopted country were both bound to fall you treated with Germany. You decided to throw in your lot with those whom you expected to be the victors. You sold yourself and your country and the country of your adoption to the enemy." There are others, like Joyce, whose anti-semitism led them to throw in their lot with the arch-anti-semite and to become in Mr. Justice Atkinson's words "that loathsome traitor, Joyce". Are these men "English" and men like General Monash in the last war or General Kisch or Major Wigram in this war "alien"?

You ask me how it comes about that even the obscurest of anti-semitic tub-thumpers in the obscurest of back streets is sure of publicity in Jewish newspapers. Why do the editors range over the Press of the world in search of trifling anti-semitic paragraphs to reprint? Do you know—a good many Jewish journalists have made the same complaint. I could quote scores of articles. I will refer only to one published in 1932 by a well-known columnist, Zivion: "We are promptly informed by the Jewish Press when an anti-semite, even an insignificant one, has spoken ill of the Jews." I am not myself fond of the practice. In 1933 I published an article complaining of the tendency in some Jewish papers to "splash lurid descriptions of pogroms. There is a sadism of licking our wounds", I wrote, "as well as of inflicting wounds." The *Jewish Chronicle* published an article on the same theme in 1936. "The real question at issue", it wrote, "is whether Jews overdo their protests, whether they may in the long run do more harm than good. If the Greeks grew tired of hearing Aristides called 'just' the moderns may grow weary of hearing the Jews called innocent. It is characteristic of others to grow impatient with constant complaint." Then the writer offered this explanation: "When the head of Louis XVI fell, it has been said, all the monarchs of

Europe felt their necks; when the blow fell on the head of German Jewry, many of us other Jews began to wonder what the future had in store for us. Apprehensiveness, even over-apprehensiveness, is understandable in such circumstances. It is unfortunate, no doubt—the manifestation of a neurotic condition. It may even be injurious to Jews themselves. ‘Fearful minorities’, said a writer in the American publication *Fortune*, ‘become suspicious minorities, their defensive reactions set on the hair trigger of anxiety, create the animosities they dread.’”

You know Hitler started as an obscure anti-semitic tub-thumper, and it wasn’t publicity in the Jewish Press that got him where he was. I know; because I was a Jewish editor myself during the years when he was tub-thumping in Germany, and in 1928 I was told by the owner that I was giving too much attention to Hitler who amounted to nothing and wasn’t worth the occasional reports I printed about his activities.

One never knows which obscure anti-semitic tub-thumper is going to be next to climb to power by means of his anti-semitic tub-thumping, and their experience has made Jews a fearful and a suspicious minority.

You ask whether you would be wrong to suggest that a measure of anti-semitism, “where there is the assurance that it will be properly controlled” (now how are we to arrange that?) helps to promote Jewish solidarity and constitutes a clarion call against Jewish indifference and schism.

It is not peculiar to Jews. Macaulay was writing of Christians when he said: “The most rigid discipline that can be enforced within a religious society is a very feeble instrument of purification, when compared with a little sharp persecution from without.”

You ask my opinion of an extract from a sermon published by the *Jewish Chronicle* to the effect that “the

greatest danger to the existence of the Jew, to the pursuance of his glorious destiny as the guardian of God's law lies not in the cruellest persecution but in genuine tolerance and security." It is a paraphrase of Holy Script. "Beware lest thou forget the Lord thy God . . . lest when thou hast eaten and art satisfied and hast built goodly houses and dwelt therein, and when thy herds and thy flocks multiply, and thy silver and thy gold is multiplied, and all that thou hast is multiplied, then thy heart be lifted up, and thou forget the Lord thy God." It is a warning against the slackness which comes with ease and prosperity, and it applies not only to Jews, but to all human beings. "Let us alone," sing Tennyson's "Lotos Eaters". "Is there any peace in ever climbing up the climbing wave?" All people tend, if left alone, to slip into the ways of those around them. If you are freely admitted to their society it is churlish to refuse to conform to their manners. How does Matthew Arnold put it?—"No sensible man will lightly go counter to an opinion firmly held by a great body of his countrymen. He will take for granted, that for any opinion which has struck deep root among a people so powerful, so successful and so well worthy of respect as the people of this country, there certainly either are or have been good and sound reasons." It is not only Jewish but all forms of non-conformity which tend to disappear if left alone.

"The freer the Jew is left", Zangwill wrote, "the more he tends, if not towards Christianity, towards a broader view of it. There can be little doubt that were the Jew left to himself and given free elbow-room, he would, in any country immune from new influxes of Jews be practically merged with his environment in a few generations. Two opposing forces are at work on the Jew—the wind and the sun. The gabardine, thrown open for a moment in the burst of heat, is buttoned tighter the next before

the biting blast." "Equal rights for the Jew—or even equal wrongs with the Russian", he wrote in another connection, when Russia was still Czarist, "would indeed bring a problem—but for the Jew; the problem of his dissolution in the melting-pot of common citizenship."

I am tempted to say something at this stage about what has been done with Russia's Jewish problem in the Soviet Union, but it is too big a subject to be treated in parenthesis.

Zangwill was a great believer in the efficacy of the melting-pot. "Every country has been and is a melting-pot", he wrote, "and not only with regard to Jews." "There does not exist in England to-day", he claims, "a single representative of the Jewish families whom Cromwell admitted." I am not altogether sure that this is so. About a year ago there died in London Mr. Arthur de Casseres, "an indefatigable Elder of the Sephardi Jewish community", whose family associations with the Sephardi Synagogue in London go back to Cromwellian times. The family is still active in Anglo-Jewish life. And there are other Jewish descendants of the Cromwellian Jews in Anglo-Jewry. But on the whole Zangwill is right about them.

I don't like this disappearance of Jews. I believe that Judaism has something valuable to give to the world. It is not the racial nor national disappearance that worries me, but the religious. There is nothing sacred about "race" in Judaism. When the Israelites went out of Egypt, "a mixed multitude went up also with them". And on that first Passover Moses commanded: "When a stranger shall sojourn with thee, and will keep the Passover to the Lord, let all his males be circumcized and then let him come near and keep it, and he shall be as one that is born in the land. One law shall be to him that is homeborn, and unto the stranger that sojourneth among

you.” “Are you not as children of the Ethiopians unto me, O children of Israel, saith the Lord”, cries the Prophet Amos. “Have not I brought up Israel out of the land of Egypt? and the Philistines from Caphtor and the Syrians from Kir?” It is not the race that matters, but the keeping of God’s commandments. No sinner will be spared because he is an Israelite. “All the sinners of my people shall die by the sword. Though they dig into hell, thence shall my hand take them. Though they climb up to heaven, thence will I bring them down.” There is the declaration by Maimonides: “Everyone who becomes a convert, and everyone who acknowledges the Unity of God as it is written in the Torah, is a disciple of our father Abraham and a member of his household. For that reason you (the convert) have the right to say, ‘our God and the God of our fathers’, because the patriarch Abraham is your father. Let not your descent be lightly esteemed in your eyes. If we trace our genealogical tree to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, you may trace yours to the Creator of the Universe.” Dr. Cecil Roth has drawn attention to “the infiltration of Gentile blood among the Jews”, and points out that “once a person had embraced Judaism, he was treated in every respect as a born Jew”.

In his Introduction to the Rabbinic Anthology which he did with Claude Montefiore, Herbert Loewe made it clear that he could not accept the so-called national idea, “which maintains that a Jew is a Jew by blood, whether he believes in God or not, whether he has adopted the Christian faith or not; that it is impossible for a Gentile to become a proselyte, since he cannot change his blood, and that a belief in God is not an essential in the definition of Judaism. Nationalism is the declaration that racial descent is equal to belief in God as a test of Judaism. But Judaism teaches ‘Thou shall have no other gods’.”

The Gentile world is full of the descendants of Jews who ceased to believe in Judaism and to practise it.

Professor Shechter reminded us that "Judaism is in the first instance a divine religion, not a mere complex of racial peculiarities and tribal customs." What happened to those Jews who did not hand down their Judaism? Jewish apostacy and merging in Germany and elsewhere did not begin only a hundred years ago. There has been a steady stream through the ages. Who knows who are their descendants to-day? You cannot rid yourself of the Jewish blood that has gone into the nations of Europe and has become inseparably and indistinguishably part of theirs. It has filtered through by now into almost everyone. This idea of biological purity of blood among the peoples of Europe and the world is a fiction. Julian Huxley calls it a myth. Even Mussolini, in the days before he had to bow to Hitler, said there are "no pure races left; not even the Jews have kept their blood unmingled. Race! It is a feeling, not a reality. Nothing will ever make me believe that biologically pure races can be shown to exist to-day."

How many Jews would there be in Italy to-day if the descendants of all the Jews who lived there since they first came in Roman times had retained their Judaism? Professor Ruppin claimed that the Arabs of Palestine are not Arabs at all, but the descendants of Moslemized Jews who remained in Palestine. Supposing it is true. What Jewish culture and Jewish life have they produced, having lost their Jewish spiritual heritage? Where are the powerful Babylonian, Persian, Alexandrian Jewries who once played such a great part in Jewish life? They did not all emigrate. The mass of them stayed where they were, and were lost to Jewry and Judaism. When the Moslems took Persia and compelled the people to adopt Islam the Jews also submitted. Cecil Roth gives other instances.

"In China", he tells us, "the Jews were already established at the period of the Han dynasty. From that time onwards the record is more or less continuous. Their history is traceable for nearly twenty centuries. Here is another Jewish civilization which has altogether disappeared. In a thousand years the Temples of New York and the Yeshivoh of Poland may have followed the Jewish Mandarins of China and the Academies of Alexandria into oblivion and decay. Jewish Palestine", he goes on, "may have withered and flowered and withered and flowered half a dozen times by then."

How, with all this very natural human intermingling, are you going to detect and eliminate all the "Jewish blood" and "Jewish influence"? It is held up against us that Jews do not intermarry and become part of the general population. But we have done and we do. Dr. Cecil Roth is now drawing attention "to the fact that Anglo-Jewry as a whole is rapidly drifting towards extinction, owing to the tremendous progress of religious indifferentism, intermarriage and even conversion." Jews do not object to intermarriage on racial grounds; they object to religious intermingling. "I can quite understand people preferring to find their life companions outside the fold," I wrote in 1931. "Marriage between Jews only is one of the sacrifices we make to maintain ourselves and our children as Jews, and to preserve our Jewish faith. Where the faith has gone, the sacrifice and the barrier have no longer any justification." The intermarriage problem is not only Jewish. St. John Ervine has a play called *Mixed Marriage*, where the problem is between Catholic and Protestant. His John Rainy "don't like Catholics and Prodesans mixin' thegither. No good", he says, "ivir comes o' the like o' that." And he turns his son and his Catholic bride out of the house because the son won't give up the Catholic. "All yer own people'll



cast ye off acause ye married a Prodesan an' A'll nivir own him fur a son if he marries a Cathlic," he tells her. There is an alien quality about everything that is different, and not only the Jew in a Christian country but also a Moslem in a Christian country and a Catholic in a Protestant country and a Protestant in a Catholic country are "alien".

Not long ago, the *Catholic Herald* was writing in an editorial: "All this amounts to a disease of anti-Catholicism comparable with the disease of anti-semitism." I have been re-reading an old speech by Daniel O'Connell. "Was it at all wonderful", he asked, "that the Catholics were despised? Our religion was reviled", he said, "and we thanked the revilers. They spit in our faces and we pay them for it." It reminded him of Shylock in the *Merchant of Venice*: "Fair Sir, you spat on me on Wednesday last; on such a day you called me dog; and for these courtesies I'll lend you so much monies."

There is a great resemblance in the language used by all fearful and suspicious minority groups. Even by great nations when they are on the defensive. I have listened to George Duhamel speaking about France, and it struck me that I had heard Jewish apologists taking a very similar line of self-justification, particularly when he enumerated all the great men France had produced and what French civilization had given to the world. We shall soon be hearing from the Germans how very much misunderstood they are and what great contributions they have given to the world.

The Jew is indeed an alien in England, but not because of his blood and his race, but because in a Christian country he is a Jew. We are living in a Christian civilization. "Ours is a Christian civilization," Mr. Middleton Murry reminds us. "Christianity has been its distinctive motive force. It is no matter of mere convenience that

we call the epoch in which we live the Christian epoch." Chaucer's line in the "Prioress's Tale" hits the mark—"Amonges christene folk a Jewerye". Professor Fisher in the *History of Europe* has the same feeling. "The acceptance of the Christian test as a mark of European fellowship has necessarily determined the relations between the old-established European races and those Asiatic peoples who at one time or another have effected a lodgment in the European continent. The Bulgars, the Hungarians and the Finns accepted with varying degrees of readiness the European religion. Religion atoned for an alien origin. It was otherwise with those (the Jew and the Moslem) who continued to maintain upon European soil a non-Christian faith." He admits of course that the founder of Christianity was nurtured in the Jewish tradition, but this does not alter the fact that "Christianity has become the European creed, though springing from a Jewish root". It is this feeling which made G. K. Chesterton argue that Jews are foreigners, because "their Jewish loyalty appears as disloyalty to the Christian State". Though here again Dean Inge, who is concerned for the Church of England, quotes George Santayana saying that "an Englishman who becomes a Catholic" (as G. K. C. did) "ceases to be an Englishman". But certainly, the Jew, though no less European, is necessarily different from his Christian fellow-citizen. Even the Christian who has ceased to be a Christian feels it about the Jew who has ceased to be a Jew. Thus Shaw can say, "I don't believe there is such a thing as a Jew but there certainly is a Sheeny." Something remains. But for how long? The Jewish Encyclopedia includes the English astronomer, Sir William Herschell, though he was not a practising Jew, but says of his son, Sir John William Herschell, that "though of considerable scientific importance, he was too far removed from Jewish influence for notice here".

I wonder too how far Shaw is right in being so sure about the Sheeny. I have always been told that Disraeli gave himself away as a Sheeny by his love of fine and rather daring clothes, by his sheer brilliance, his exaggeration, his passion for the centre of the stage, the glitter of the limelight. But I find that these are the very qualities which Dickens's biographer describes as characteristic of Dickens. And Carson was not a Sheeny, though Wells says he was the most "un-English" of men.

General Booth, who founded the Salvation Army, was often spoken of as a Sheeny, and his features suggested it, though his Jewish origin is doubtful. I don't think that Dr. Barnado, who started the Barnado Homes, was so spoken of, but his father was born a Jew. Both Booth and Barnado were earnest Christians, and neither can be considered in any way Jews.

There are very important differences between Jew and Christian which I am not going to minimize, and I know that they often lead to difficulties. There was a debate some time ago in the House of Commons and a member who sat for a London constituency which has a large Jewish population, spoke of Jews who keep the Saturday Sabbath "doing something which is repugnant to the Christian" because they work on Sunday. Another M.P. complained of some young Jews on a farm in his constituency refusing to milk the cows on Friday night, when the Sabbath begins early. If these very real differences between Jew and Christian are being obliterated to-day because of a general slackening of religious feeling among both Jew and Christian, I will not pretend that I like it. Whatever implication of being alien there is in the Jew who observes his Judaism in a Christian environment I will accept without question. But why on other grounds the Jew whose family has lived here for two hundred years should be less English than the descendant of a

Huguenot who came here about the same time, or why the Jew who was born and bred here and feels at home nowhere else should be regarded as less native than the London-born son of an Italian or Frenchman who has had no alien religion to keep him different, I cannot conceive.

“The English composite character betrays a mixed origin”, Emerson told us. “Everything English is a fusion of distant and antagonistic elements. The language is mixed. Neither do the people appear to be of one stem; but collectively a better race than any from which they are derived. Who can call by right names what races are in Britain? Who can trace them historically? Who can discriminate them anatomically or metaphysically?” To-day, when we have the blend, can we realize how alien to each other were the Saxon and Norman, Celtic and Danish elements that went to make the foundation of the English character? “For a century and a half England was a subject nation under a military despotism,” writes an English historian. “French was the official language, and Normans held all the high offices in civil and military life. The Saxon played an inferior role under the Norman baron. Gradually racial strife and bitterness began to disappear. In the course of the centuries, Briton and Roman, Saxon and Norseman and Norman, all in their measure contributed to the character of the mixed nation that was to be the kernel of the Empire of to-day. Intermixture by marriage and commingling of ideas from different racial and religious sources have all tended to that independent and tolerant spirit that has become so characteristic of the united peoples.” “In America, the peoples of the world are being fused together”, Sir Charles Dilke has said, “but they are run into an English mould: Alfred’s laws and Chaucer’s tongue are theirs whether they would or no.”

The people living in any country tend to approximate to a norm. Thus you will not dispute James Truslow Adams's contention that though "the American is a hodge-podge, consisting of more racial and language groups than live anywhere else under one Government", and "in 1930 close to one-third of our population was foreign-born or of foreign-born parentage", yet "there are some dominant traits in the American," and there is such a thing as a "recognizable American".

"I cannot see", you write, "how you can support your claim to being part of the English entity, if by that you claim to be an Englishman. A British subject, yes, and a man we should be proud to greet as a British subject. But an Englishman? You are no more an Englishman than is Walter Elliot or Bernard Shaw. The first is a Scot, the second an Irishman, and you are a Jew." "Admittedly", you go on, "the concept of 'British' has rather slurred over the distinctive outlines of English nationality. I think that a bad thing, to be redressed."

I think I understand what you want to say. But surely the difference between the Scot and the Irishman is not the same thing as the difference between the Englishman and the Jew, who should be a member of a particular religious community, with a very definite religious outlook. And *The Times* does not agree with your definition of what is English. In writing of some foreign refugees in the East End, it says that their children "are now as English as are the descendants of the early Irish railway labourers in neighbouring Wapping".

I have said that the English Jew insofar as he is a Jew and not a Christian is to that extent alien in this Christian country. But that does not mean that he does not bear the ineradicable marks of his birth and upbringing on English soil, in English surroundings and in the English language, which make him different from any other Jew

whose soil and surroundings and language are elsewhere and different. Zangwill in his picture of the First Zionist Congress in "Dreamers of the Ghetto", writes of those assembled there: "Who speaks of the Jewish type? One can only say negatively that these faces are not Christian." And he goes on to describe the differences between them, all bearing the distinctive marks of their native lands. A writer in the *Jewish Chronicle* drew attention to "the sharp difference of outlook and of custom between those Jews born and bred in the English tradition and those coming from the Continental centres." The cleavage must in the nature of things" she wrote, "become even wider after the terrible catastrophe that has befallen European Jewry. It becomes increasingly difficult for the growing generation to identify themselves in thought and in work with the victims of Europe, other than in the high and noble sphere of charitable concern. This is not said in any spirit of smug complacency, nor with any suggestion of the superiority of the English Jew. But a difference that has existed for many years will probably in the nature of things come to a climax after the war."

It brings out I think the whole point of the contact which exists between the Jews of different countries, the concern that Jews have always shown for their "co-religionists" abroad. I think there is something more than "high and noble charitable concern" involved in Jewish interest in the fate of Jews in other countries. And I certainly do not believe there is any Jewish superiority in the English Jew. We have Jewishly a great deal to learn from what will after the extermination be left of East European Jewry. Shechter records a conversation he had with a foreign Jew who drew his attention to a book written by a Russian Jew, with the express purpose of checking the mystical tendencies represented by the Chassidim, "and I challenge you", he said "to show me in your Anglo-

Judean publications a single page equalling it in spirituality and religious feeling." "I am now reading the book", Shechter added, "and I am compelled to confess that our 'alien' was right."

Religiously, Jewishly, we English Jews still have much to learn from our co-religionists abroad. But except for the European countries, from which the parents and grandparents of many of us came, and for which there is something of the same feeling that an American of English descent might feel for England, the relationship is much more like that of the English Christian for fellow-Christians in Russia or Roumania or Armenia or Syria. What more moved Moses Montefiore to undertake his journey to Morocco to obtain protection from the Sultan for the persecuted Moroccan Jews than made Gladstone thunder his denunciations of Turkey when the Armenian Christians were being massacred? "I apprehend it to be beyond doubt", he said, "that the hopes of the Christians in European Turkey have been directed to this country or to Russia." The Baptists in England and in America have been very active on behalf of the rights of the persecuted Baptists in Roumania. And I know how interested the Church of England is in the rights of Christians in the Soviet Union. Should the Jew have less interest in the rights of his fellow-Jews in other lands? Why should it affect his position in his own country?

The Jew is a non-conforming element, a dissenter. But is non-conformity really so bad for the life of the country? The history of dissent forms a great and noble chapter in the life of man. And we Jews, by our stubborn adherence to our beliefs have contributed to it. The line of least resistance is easy. It needs moral guts to stand out for your beliefs and convictions, and I do not believe that these qualities of tenacity and stubbornness and faithfulness to what we believe are without value in the weaving

of that composite fabric, the national character. They are not unimportant beliefs, to which we hold firm for a fancy and a whim; they are to us eternal truths, for which Jews have gone to exile from lands that were dear to them, have gone to their death proudly proclaiming the glory of God who spoke out of the thunder at Sinai. Will England call those alien who have handed down the Decalogue?

If I have said anything to suggest that I am trying to argue that there is no difference between the English Jew and the great mass of the English Christian people, I have explained myself badly; for what I wanted to do is to show not that there is no difference, but that the difference is not between alien nations, but between Jew and Christian.

“It is by standing forth as Jews”, the late L. J. Greenberg, for many years editor of the *Jewish Chronicle*, has written, “and proclaiming by the lives we lead that there is nothing inconsistent in our being Jews, not only religiously, but Jewish in spirit and thought, and our being loyal citizens and worthy subjects of the State. We must break down the barbaric notion that loyalty, good citizenship and the well-being of the State are dependent on origin, just as it has always been our business to protest, as Jews throughout the ages have protested even with their lives, against the notion that the interests of a country are to be served by a uniformity of creed.”

J.L.



## CHAPTER FOUR

### Jewishness and Englishness

MY DEAR LEFTWICH,

With your permission I will comment here on some of the interesting points you raise, and in the next chapter break fresh ground. You say that Germany is the answer to any suggestion that anti-semitism may be a Jewish racket, but it does not seem to me necessarily a complete answer. The fate of Frankenstein is not rare in this world, as Adolf Hitler himself discovered. Neither can I agree that World Jewry has been impotent in the face of that threat. The old propaganda against Tsarist Russia has been excelled only by the propaganda against Germany sustained throughout the world since 1933 and culminating—with Hitler's enthusiastic co-operation—in the war of 1939. You believe that had there been no invasion of Poland there would have been no war, and you may be right, but in that event it would not be for lack of Jewish endeavour to bring one about. Does that not stand to reason? A nation produces a revolution in which the Jews, for good reasons or for bad, are ruthlessly deprived of many of their civic rights. Surely it is natural that Jews throughout the world should combine and employ every possible means—beginning with boycott and ending if need be with war—to bring that nation to its knees. I understand that Mr. Emil Ludwig, writing in *Les Annales* dated June, 1934, stated: "Hitler will have no war, but he will be forced to it, not this year, but later on." In a sermon published by the *Jewish Chronicle* on 8th May, 1942 occurs the statement: "We have been at war with him (Hitler) from the first day that he gained power." You may say that in this instance the Jewish campaign against Germany accorded with the best interests of man-

kind. That is a question much too immense to be debated here, but in any case one can easily imagine circumstances wherein the contrary would hold true. Sir Ronald Storrs has told, in his book *Orientalisms*, how, when Military Governor of Jerusalem, it was impossible for him to grant certain Jewish demands, with the result that newspapers throughout the United States promptly published cartoons holding up to ridicule the British officer class: indeed, there is abundant evidence that Britain's attempts to hold the scales evenly in Palestine have been responsible for much of the anti-British propaganda on the other side of the Atlantic. Such manoeuvres are understandable enough from the Jewish point of view, but, from the point of view of the nations who might be set at each other's throats, propaganda of this kind is an unmitigated menace. At any rate—to return to Germany—I imagine that there can have been few Jews, when they heard the great bombers zooming overhead on their deadly midnight missions to the Reich, who did not feel that more was involved than Britain sweeping to her redress, and this aspect would seem to be symbolized by the special appointment of so many Jews to administer German affairs.

Since the German invasion of Czechoslovakia drew from my pen a scathing indictment of Hitler's aggression, I shall not now, I hope, be accused of aspiring to act as his apologist, and certainly I will not allow myself to be put into any position where I appear to condone acts of violence against the Jews. Even so, I must ask what inference is to be drawn from your statement that anti-semitism drips with blood. Is it your proposition that, because criticism of the Jews has led to violence against the Jews, the criticism against the Jews is socially or morally wrong? If so, I cannot tell you how much I disagree. One might as well go to Lord Vansittart and

say "Your anti-Germanism is indefensible. Have you not thought of the appalling bloodshed which has resulted from two major wars?" So as to remove any possible ambiguity about my attitude, however, let me assure you that I would be happy to support special measures which would make unprovoked physical assaults by Gentiles on Jews—and vice versa—for a political purpose a capital offence, and direct incitement thereto might well be similarly punished. But my right to criticize Jews or Jewry I should defend by every means consistent with loyalty to my King, since deprivation of that right could only be justified by the complete withdrawal of Jews from participation in British affairs. Many Jews seem to think that such freedom should be unilateral; perhaps in time they will make it so. A Bill has already been introduced into the American Congress to make all criticism of the Jews "illegal and immoral"!

When you speak of the success of the Mosley Movement in whipping up anti-Jewish feeling you unconsciously support my suggestion that anti-semitism may be a Jewish racket, for it was the Jews themselves who made that movement anti-semitic. Mosley did not begin with any views on the Jewish question. Indeed, at first he denied that there was a need for any special attitude towards the Jews, his belief being that the anti-social economic practices against which the propaganda of his movement was directed could be eliminated by laws framed to embrace all sections of the community without racial or other distinction. I remember in 1933 explaining this at great length to an intelligent Jew who was himself drawn to the idea of a Jewish Fascism.

"You say Mosley is not anti-semitic now," he said, "but I am willing to wager that within two years at most he will be forced into anti-semitism."

"Forced by whom?" I asked.

"The Jews," he replied.

"Why?"

He shrugged his shoulders. "It's inherent in the situation", he said. Events proved him right.

At the beginning of the B.U.F.'s chequered history speakers who put over their personal views on the Jewish question were barred from the rostrum; some were even expelled. Some Jews belonged to the movement, and others were attracted by its political, social and economic concepts. This did not prevent the B.U.F. being violently attacked by other Jews. A Jewish body called the British Union of Democrats came into existence for the purpose and sent van-loads of Jews all over the country to break up Blackshirt meetings. This was later largely superseded by an organization purporting to represent Jewish ex-servicemen, although it was noticed that many of its members on the march were several years too young to have earned the war medals which they sported (usually in the wrong order) on their blue and white shirts. It was also discovered that of the total numbers of persons indicted for assaults on Blackshirts over 50 per cent. were Jews. Genuinely puzzled (I have the clearest possible mental picture of him at that time) Mosley ordered a thorough research into the Jewish question, especially into the financial and political activities which the movement attacked, and it was then found that there was a very close identification between these activities and specific Jewish interests. Rightly or wrongly Mosley imagined that he had stumbled upon the secret of Jewry's bitter attack on his movement. It may be that he had done nothing of the kind: that the phenomenon was due simply to the fear and suspicion of which you write. Be that as it may, is it not deplorable that a movement which came into existence to preach a straightforward doctrine of patriotism and economic reform should have been

driven into a racial policy by the very people who had most to lose from the implementing of that policy? If we are to discard the theory of the racket and adopt the theory of a Jewish neurosis, then I think we must agree that the cure of that neurosis must be a Jewish responsibility. So long as it remains in being it will assuredly go on manufacturing anti-semitism.

I should like to mention one aspect of the manufacture of anti-semitism which is difficult to explain on the basis of fear, and if I write about it with some heat (it will, I hope, be the only heat in my contribution to this book) I am sure you will readily understand the reason. I refer to the unpardonable effrontery of those Jews (several of them prominent people) who sought in the earlier days of the war to associate anti-semitism with treason to Britain. Could any propaganda, from the Jewish point of view alone, be more hideously maladroit? Every man and woman in the country who had ever expressed views critical of the Jews was thus dubbed a traitor to his own King and people! I know of several instances wherein individuals who had only a mild dislike of the Jews were turned by the very suggestion into raging anti-semites. Frankly I do not know what element in the Jewish make-up it is that so wantonly creates enemies for Jewry.

My last observation on this particular subject is that while I accept your explanation about suspicion and fear as dictating the attitude of the great mass of Jews I still feel that the leaders of Jewry may sometimes play upon those emotions for their own ends. Otherwise what did Dr. Herzl mean when he said that the cry of anti-semitism always brings the sheep into the fold?

You ask me what English qualities went into the making of Houston Chamberlain, of young John Amery, of Hewitt, and of William Joyce. How does one answer a question of that kind? What Jewish qualities went to the

making of Trebitch Lincoln; of any other Jew who went off the rails? All I have gathered about Houston Chamberlain from attempting to read his books is that he was mad. I have no knowledge of Amery apart from the information, obviously irrelevant even if correct, that he was partly of Jewish blood. I had never heard of Hewitt until I read about his case. The only man of those you mention whom I do know is Joyce, whose lucidity of mind and whose fervent British patriotism ten years ago earned my respect. You may well imagine my shock when first I heard his voice over the German radio. Either his earlier views had been feigned, as I am sure they were not, or he had allowed anti-semitism to swamp his reason. Such of these men as were Englishmen did their country abominable wrong, however pure or impure the personal motive may have been. General Kisch and Major Wigram with whom you contrast them are not Englishmen. They are Jews—Jews who have performed for the country of their adoption most gallant and distinguished services. What more is there to be said?

Well, Leftwich, there is this to be said. Is it not a triumph for the British people that in your search for traitors among them you are able to name only four or five or six? How does this record contrast with that of the thousands of German Jews who were ranged against their country and loudly proclaiming, as many of them did, that they were proud to be traitors to their country? Heaven knows, I do not blame them; if I were a German Jew I would have behaved exactly as they behaved. The point I wish to make, however, is that I do not expect from Jews the same loyalty to the country of their adoption as I would expect from natives to their own land and people—especially when they have been foully treated therein. A German Jew working for the British Ministry of Information would not strike me as being a traitor,

whereas a native German doing the same thing, no matter how badly he had been treated at home, would arouse in me very much the same emotions as those that I feel towards treasonable Englishmen. Many of my own personal friends have been treated very badly indeed by their own country, having been imprisoned without trial for years, but in not one instance, to my certain knowledge, were these innocent men embittered by their experience to the point of adopting a treasonable attitude towards Britain. Several of them later joined the Forces, and their letters to me proclaimed that they were as keen and wholehearted in the performance of their loyal duties as men who had not been called upon to suffer such injuries.

I come now to your statement that the Jews were not responsible for the old slave-trade or for the appalling by-products of the Industrial Revolution. Of course they were not responsible. The slave-trade was largely an English racket, but it was also stopped by the people of England, who pushed Wilberforce at a faster rate than he thought it possible to go. The evil aspect of the Industrial Revolution was due in part to the harsh materialism of many English factory owners, and in part to the false economic doctrine preached by a mistaken English school of economics. From 1832 onwards, however, English reformers have been progressively mitigating the evils of that system, until to-day our factory and other social welfare laws are perhaps the most enlightened in the world. It is true that the Jews cannot justifiably incur reproach for the less amiable side of our industrial history, but I am not so sure that the same thing holds good to-day. Or is the phrase "Jewish sweat-shop" just another anti-semitic invention?

However that may be, it is in the region of commerce that we first really come up against the Jewish question.

It is no part of my case that the Jews in general are a criminal element in our society: the reverse is true. I have rarely heard of Jews in this country being associated with the darker crimes—murder, robbery, sexual offences and the rest. This seems to me to prove conclusively that the Jews in Britain are neither a violent nor a depraved people. But in the commercial world there is no doubt, to my mind, that Jews as a whole do not maintain that good conduct record. The jokes about fire-raising do not spring from a joke, for arson, as you will agree, is a serious matter. Neither is fraudulent bankruptcy a joke. And those insurance companies which, over a wide range of policies, refuse to insure Jews certainly do not turn down potential business for a joke. A life-long friend of my family, one who has spent forty years as a Home Office Chief Clerk at London police courts, tells me that when the police begin to unravel a big commercial conspiracy it almost always begins with the raking in of Gentiles on the fringe and ends with the arrest of a nest of Jews in the centre. That friend is not anti-Jew and he was not making propaganda against Jewry. I know that there are thousands of perfectly honest Jewish traders, yet the hard fact remains that all over the world such offences come definitely to be linked with Jewry, just as the profession of usury has come to be linked with Jewry. It is no answer, with submission, to say that honest Jews condemn such things. Of course they do, but their condemnation does not succeed in putting a stop to them. Moreover, the charges of illegal commercial practices so constantly levelled against Jews pale before the charges of unfair commercial practices urged against them. I think it can be set down as a universal experience that wherever Jews and Gentiles have competed in business on any large scale the invariable result has been a perpetual protest by the Gentile against the tricks and sharp-practices of the



Jew. The Jews are fond of ascribing this protest to Gentile envy. So long as they do that, so long will anti-semitism in the business world continue. I do not deny that the phenomenon of the Jew's success in commerce may sometimes be traced to innocuous and even to virtuous causes—the community interest among Jews, which is a very real thing, the agility of the Jewish mind, the Jew's tremendous power of concentration, his flair and so on, but over and above these factors must surely be placed the unsleeping, unrelenting, exorbitant love of money which in every age and in every clime has been noted as the chief characteristic of the Jew exhibited to the Gentile world. To suggest that this, too, is an anti-semitic invention, carefully nurtured and handed down from one generation to another, would be, grotesquely, a sort of Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion in reverse.

Now the Jew at heart is a deeply religious person and I want you, if you will, to explain what relation there is between the Jew's religion and his commercial code. Have you read a book called *Journey into Morning*, the work of Max Mundlack, a brilliant optician of London? In it he makes the chief character reflect thus: "In the street, in the course of one's struggle for subsistence, one could cheat and lie and hoodwink and throw dust in an opponent's eyes and still feel clean." Does this suggest that there is a special Jewish attitude to commerce, and, if so, how does it square with the Jewish religion?

Further, is there in modern Jewish religious doctrines the laying down of one law for the Jew and another for the Gentile? In other words, has the Talmud been rejected? You will see the force of this question, since—as you know—the Talmud depicts the Gentile as a hewer of wood and a drawer of water, an inferior creature without rights, to be exploited and despoiled as the Jews desire. If this doctrine is still presented to Jewish youth, it might seem

that one need go little further in one's search for an explanation of the general commercial picture which I have drawn—or, for that matter, for the source of anti-semitism.

You refer to the rich spiritual heritage which England has derived from the Hebrew. That is undeniable and I gladly acknowledge it. But where does that argument lead? We have derived much, too, from the Hellenic and Roman epochs, but we would not be disposed, on that account, to welcome a Greek or Italian "problem" in these islands. You are quite right when you suggest that culturally no nation can live unto itself alone; that any nation which tried to do so would be infinitely the poorer because of its stupidity. Whatever is best in literature and of the arts should be internationally shared, but I suggest that the best is likely to be that most deep-rooted in a national soil. Would Shakespeare be universal if he were not so English? The works of individual Jews of genius admitted, it remains to ask what contribution corporate Jewry has made to the culture of mankind since it was uprooted from its own soil nearly two thousand years ago. What is Jewry's contribution at the present day? The average cinema film, crooning, jazz, the decayed music-hall—the Jew is prominently identified with these things, and nearly always at their lowest level: he is even identified with them to the extent that people have come to look upon them as manifestations of the Jewish spirit. That, of course, is nonsense, but I do not think it would be nonsense to describe them as manifestations of the Jewish love of gain. If you admit the Jewish nexus here I know that you will deplore it, since it marks so abysmal a falling away from the sublime Hebraic traditions. Possibly you may say, in extenuation, that there would be no Jewish supply if there were no Gentile demand, and it would be merely polemical for me to argue in reply that

supply may create the demand. Far better would it be for us to unite in lamenting the spectacle of the men of your religious inheritance and the men of my national inheritance renouncing their respective traditions and going hand-in-hand to live in the evil stews of Cosmopolis.

There is no need for me to say much about your remark that there are no pure races, because of course I agree. I do not take up any racial attitude except to abominate the intermixture of white and coloured peoples. Nations, providing their elements are assimilable, do not require pure stock in order to be nations. The national entity is real. One point among the many which interest me in your previous chapters is the statement that the Jews are not an exclusive community, providing that entrants to the Jewish world conform to the requirements of that world. Is not that the crux of the whole problem we are discussing in this book? The Jews will accept converts on their own terms, but resent the fact that the English should seek to accept new citizens on English terms; at any rate, once Jews are admitted into England it is not long before they are in responsible positions and actively engaged in modifying those terms. The bad Jews disregard them altogether, while even the best Jew (as I suggest in my first chapter) succeeds by virtue of his mere "separateness" in changing the traditional atmosphere and thereby not only changing the terms of life for himself but also, in the long run, the terms of life for Englishmen. It is unlikely, that Judaism will ever be invaded by large numbers of English converts, but if such a thing were to happen, and if in consequence the Jews came to recognize a threat to their most cherished values because the English converts, without quite understanding the nature of those values, began to accumulate great influence, how long would it be before the Jews closed their community to newcomers on any terms whatever?

My heart goes out to you when you say that what you want is not less, but more, Jewishness. The community which lacks that feeling is already decadent and corrupt. What I, too, want is not less, but more Englishness. Would these two aspects of the same ideal, if realized, result in an aggravation of the Jewish problem? Perhaps they would. An increased Jewishness would lead, very properly, to a more resolute refusal to be assimilated. An increased Englishness would lead, also very properly in my opinion, to a greater disinclination to allow Jews to participate too freely in the running of English affairs. But at least, approached in your spirit and in mine, a bridge of understanding could be built between us and we could then tackle our outstanding problems as sensible men, greatly to the benefit of their possible solution. It may be said that friendship between Jews and Englishmen already exists at many levels. That is true enough and where the friendship is personal and sincere it is to be respected. But what I may call "political friendship"—perhaps "public friendship" would be the better term—always seems to me to be horribly suspect. I despise with all the passion of my soul those dignitaries of Church and State who seem to act as stooges for Jewry, and there is some evidence that the sound Jew despises them no less. These people for the most part are spiritually de-nationalized, and as for you a lapsed Jew is a lost Jew, so for me the internationalized Englishman is a lapsed and lost Englishman—a spiritual traitor. There are many such traitors to-day.

A.K.C.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### Jewish International Power

MY DEAR LEFTWICH,

We must be careful, I feel, not to misquote each other. I have not charged the Jews with establishing the masterdom over mankind to which you refer. That is the assertion of men whom I can only describe as "ideological" anti-semites—simple souls who find in Jewish inspiration the common denominator of all the diverse activities of mankind. "When you understand the Jewish Question," they say, "everything becomes clear to you." The human mind has a passion for over-simplification; it delights in referring all phenomena to one master-plan and imagining that in the possession of such a plan it is adequately equipped to penetrate into the heart of every mystery. Thus the "ideological" anti-semite persuades himself that a secret Jewish government has existed through the ages for the purpose of waging unceasing war upon the Gentile world, ruining Gentile culture and destroying the Christian religion, with the ultimate object of enslaving the Gentiles in a Jewish World State. Some with a taste for mysticism see the Jew quite literally as Satan and build up round their anti-semitism an astonishing edifice of black and white magic, founded upon the Bible or the Pyramids or the Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion or whatever else may have found a lodging in their honest craniums. It thus becomes a simple matter to trace every evil to its source!

Now I have never been tempted to embrace any of these extravagant theories. I am not interested in a secret Jewish government, for which there seems to be very little direct evidence, although it would not be surprising, in the special circumstances in which the Jews are placed,

if they had not for their own protection evolved some such co-ordinating body to look after their interests and bring secret pressure to bear upon the Gentile nations, for the benefit of Jewry as a whole. In any case I am no more prepared to assert that such a body exists than you, presumably, would be prepared to assert that such a body does not exist, since the essence of a secret government is—secrecy! Nor would I argue that the Jews are consciously engaged in a struggle to destroy Gentile institutions. My mind recoils in horror—and incredulity—from the diabolical wickedness attributed to the Learned Elders of Zion, whoever they may or may not be. Where events seem to bear out the alleged plan of campaign in the Protocols I much prefer to find for them some less dramatic and more human explanation, and indeed am disposed to dismiss the whole of the Protocols as the work of gravely disordered minds. But you may be able to help me to do this with greater conviction, and with a much easier conscience, by explaining three points which worry me.

First, it seems to me that the Protocols are spiritually on the same level as those passages in the Talmud which aspire to regulate the Jewish attitude towards the Gentile world.

Second, while I know of no Gentile who is endeavouring to undermine the faith of Jews in the Jewish religion (except for proselytizing purposes), I know of a large number of Jews who are engaged—one, at least, professionally—in the task of trying to break down Gentile faith in Christianity.

The third point cannot be stated quite as briefly. Assuming for the moment that the Jews—or rather a number of influential Jews acting in unison—had determined to destroy the characteristic features of English life (features which they might have regarded as an impediment to the

extension of their own influence) one would expect their main assault to fall on the English aristocracy, as the custodians of a somewhat exclusive national spirit hostile to alien infiltration. To do this they would attack the basis of aristocratic life—ownership of the land. It so happens that this attack has not only been made but has succeeded. The landed gentry have received a mortal blow. To-day there is no aristocracy in Britain; only a plutocratic simulacrum possessing few if any of the distinctive British virtues. The House of Lords, with one or two noble exceptions, now represents nothing or nobody that it could be expected to represent: the bulk of its members are frightened even to question the presence of unnaturalized German Jews in Britain's governmental war departments. Now this campaign to destroy the aristocracy by striking at its basis of land-ownership is set out in detail in the Protocols, and those obsessed with the supposed plots of the Learned Elders say, not altogether unnaturally: "There you are! The Jews said they would do this thing, and this thing has duly been done. Down with the Jews!" My own temperamental approach, other things being equal, would be to argue that the phenomenon was due to the social ferments of the age, not to any sinister design on the part of Jews or anybody else, and I would continue to hold this view even though I knew that the Government which placed the heaviest burdens on the landowners was a Government very closely associated with Jewish finance. But I must confess to you the very grave doubt which arose in my mind as to whether so generous a view could be justified when I came across this passage in L. Fry's *Waters Flowing Eastwards*.

"There has been recently published a volume of Herzl's Diaries, a translation of some passages of which appeared in the *Jewish Chronicle* of 14th July, 1922. Herzl gives an

account of his first visit to London in 1895, and his conversation with Colonel Goldsmid, a Jew brought up as a Christian, an officer in the English Army, and at heart a Jewish Nationalist all the time. Goldsmid suggested to Herzl that the best way of expropriating the English Aristocracy and so destroying their power to protect the people of England against Jew domination, was to put excessive taxes on the land. Herzl thought this an excellent idea, and it is now to be found definitely embodied in Protocol No. 6."

I think you will agree that no Englishman could read a statement of this kind without alarm, or without beginning to wonder whether Jewish activity was quite as adventitious as he had hitherto supposed.

My purpose here is not to plunge into an argument as to the authenticity or otherwise of the Protocols—that question seems to me of very little importance—but to point out the possibility that there really may be such a thing as a continuing Jewish policy in these matters. It is no part of my case that the world is ruled by some secret conclave of Jews, but it is a large part of my case that certain Jews, sometimes in one combination, sometimes in another, exert such tremendous power as pressure-groups that the world is often hurtled in the direction they wish it to go.

This brings us to what is for me the crux of the problem—Jewish power. You admit that Jews take a hand in international finance (the greatest of all the power-mechanisms) but you do not consider that it is a dominant hand. I believe, with absolute conviction, that you are profoundly mistaken. The essential feature of international finance is that it is international. The essential feature of international Jewry is that it is international. In these two inescapable facts, to my mind, lies the whole secret of Jewish power. The Jew, by virtue of his racial



and religious affiliations, is more easily at home in any part of the world than any other branch of the human family. Since the Jews have the gift of achieving great wealth and position within national frontiers, does it not stand to reason that the presence of equally wealthy and influential co-religionists (or co-racials) in other lands presents them with a prodigious advantage when they reach out beyond those frontiers to concert measures for their united advantage with Jews abroad also anxious to participate in establishing an international chain of interests? If this is not so, I can only ask why it is not so: why the Jews, admittedly dynamic in business, should negligently throw away such providential opportunities of acquiring for themselves a unique world position in trade and commerce and, above all, in finance.

I do not imply that Jewry constitutes a perpetual phalanx; that its members always see eye-to-eye on all matters, even on matters affecting their own religion or high political ends; or that they do not ruthlessly compete against each other when that is in their interest: I have read of far too many violent Jewish quarrels to entertain any such belief. Nevertheless I maintain that both within and without national boundaries the enduring community of interests possessed by the Jews is faithfully reflected in many of their economic and political pursuits. Once they begin to enter a business it is only a question of time before they bring in many others in their wake. In the same way, once they invade a trade it is not long before that trade becomes predominantly Jewish. If you were to follow up their various international business associates, moreover, you would find that they, too, were predominantly Jewish. The fur trade, the clothing make-up trade, the furniture trade, the popular catering trade, the film industry—with submission one could wander round the higher reaches of these various departments of human

activity in every country and very rarely come face-to-face with a Gentile. If this be true in trade—and I am sure it is very largely true—why should the same thing not hold good in the realm of finance, which has been associated with Jewry since European history began?

Indeed, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the world financial system as we know it to-day was invented by Jews and has been perfected by Jews. By dealing in money as a commodity to be bought and sold, by creating and controlling credit, by moving gold backwards and forwards between the nations, Jewish financiers have managed to build up enormous personal wealth within each country, and I need not stress the fact that personal wealth carries with it not only economic power but great political power as well. "Permit me to issue and control a nation's money" declared Baron Rothschild, "and I care not who makes its laws." That power in the hands of the Jews becomes not only a national but a supra-national weapon. There have been competitors like Morgan and Rockefeller, admittedly, but nobody ever heard of an American Rockefeller in Washington who had for brothers a French Rockefeller in Paris, a British Rockefeller in London, a German Rockefeller in Berlin and an Austrian Rockefeller in Vienna. That, or something like it, was the position of the Rothschild family in the last century, and it was also roughly the position of other financial houses in the last war but one. Is it possible to contend that members of a financial family so placed can be relied upon to place their national loyalties beyond reach of blood and common interest? Or is it not more likely that their attitude towards, let us say, a war between the nations to which they technically belong resembles that of the promoters of a prize-fight? It is established beyond all doubt, for instance, that German

Jewish financial interests in Britain between 1914-18 were specially protected by British Jewish interests over here, and I also know of cases where—by what mechanism I can only guess—British Jews with investments in Germany continued to draw their dividends throughout the war.

The picture of the entire set-up was drawn by Disraeli in that famous Coningsby passage wherein Sidonia (Rothschild?) described his visits to the European capitals, finding in each Jews occupying key-positions in both politics and finance, and reflecting with satisfaction that the world was ruled by very different men from those the public supposed. Was that merely a piece of imaginative writing? Let us see. In the last war but one a ship set sail from a Latin-American port. The British Government wanted it stopped and applied to—the Rothschilds! The Rothschilds stopped it! Haig learnt of his appointment as commander-in-chief from—Lord Rothschild! The matter goes still deeper. A decade before 1914, when the offer of Uganda to the Jews was rejected, the Zionists were told that a war was on the way, and that in the course of it Palestine would pass, for bestowal, into Britain's hands. A remarkable prophecy, to say the least! In 1937 a well-known British Jew was reported by William Hickey as referring to plans which he proposed to carry out "after the war". I am not citing these instances, let me again insist, in support of any theory that mankind is controlled by absolute Jewish power, able at will to determine the course of history. That this is not so is proved—if proof were needed to repudiate such an absurdity—by two signal Jewish failures. First, the Munich Agreement—afterwards redressed. Second, the still incomplete usufruct of Palestine by Jews—which no doubt will be redressed in the very near future. What I do cite these instances to prove, however, is that when Jewish finan-

ciers, or any considerable group of them, decide to concert their activities, in either the political or the economic fields, they constitute the most formidable single pressure-group in the world. And their chief weapon, I really must insist, is the national and international control of credit—what Dr. Herzl called “the terrible power of our purse”. Therefore I must disagree with you when you argue that Jewry is not dominant in international finance; the only concession I can make here is to admit that Jewry in this sphere is not as yet omnipotent.

But Jewish finance does not rely exclusively upon big-scale capitalism for instrumenting its power. It has also made a profound study of the revolutionary technique, and not without good reason, since it is to the French Revolution that Jewry owes its full emancipation in Europe. There is little evidence that Jewish influences played any considerable part in instigating that upheaval, nor are Jews markedly associated with its direction—although perhaps they had something to do with the withholding of grain, at every critical juncture, from the Paris markets—but that they benefited enormously from the overthrow of the old régime is surely incontestable. Those benefits, moreover, did not derive solely from the birth of liberalism: they were, so to speak, spot cash benefits. Napoleon lifted up his hands in amazement at the phenomenon. “By what miracle”, he asked in 1806, “did whole provinces of France become heavily mortgaged to the Jews, when there are only sixty thousand of them in the country?” Nor was the financial phenomenon confined to France. The real victor of Waterloo was Rothschild.

Jews took a larger share in the '48, but it was not until the Russian Revolution broke out that the world could judge of the truly astounding extent to which Jewry had become identified with popular revolutionary movements

everywhere. And again Jewish finance was in the vanguard. It so happened that in 1914 Russia was the one country in Europe where the Jewish emancipation was far from complete—a fact which perhaps explains why she was subjected to such an unfavourable World Press, and why we heard so much about Siberia in those days, whereas in these days we hear very little about a Siberia which has become a much vaster and bleaker Hell. At any rate it seems clear enough that Jewish supranational finance had two major—and in the beginning possibly incompatible—war aims: the defeat of Russia and the attainment of Palestine. It had been financing the Russian revolutionaries for at least ten years before 1917, and during the war further funds were forthcoming both from New York and Hamburg. The mob-leaders of the Revolution, moreover, had been by the hundred shipped (in the midst of war) from New York to Russia, and they were—I believe without exception—Jews. I do not think that you will deny that the Revolution, with the exception of Lenin, was Jew-led, Jew-financed and predominantly Jew-executed. If what I have just said is correct, moreover, the Jewish bankers in New York, to manage things so neatly, must have had very great influence with the American Government. Their influence, in fact extended still wider. One does not need to search for hidden motives in the action of the German Government which permitted Lenin and his associates free passage across Germany to start the revolution going. It was in Germany's interest to push Russia out of the war. Britain's interest, on the other hand, was to keep Russia fighting Germany. Can you tell me, Leftwich, why Britain, despite this vital necessity, did for Trotsky what Germany did for Lenin—granted him a free-passage, in this case all the way from Newfoundland?

Once again I do not go for my explanation to any

flamboyant theory that Britain at that time was completely under the heel of American Jewish finance and had to do as she was ordered. Here, I think, is what really happened. We have been told that the Balfour Declaration was made because Lord Rothschild had spoken about Palestine "with a tear in his eye", and because Dr. Weizman had discovered acetone. Probably neither you nor I are completely convinced by this charmingly naïve account of the business. The Declaration was obviously made in order to create a favourable impression on American Jewry and so facilitate the entry of the United States into the war. As it became clear that Menshevik Russia was incapable of continuing the war, so did the intervention of the U.S.A. become for Britain an issue of paramount importance. Is it not certain that the powerful Jews around Lloyd George reached an agreement with the still more powerful Jews around Wilson, one of the terms of which was Trotsky's safe-conduct? Whatever the answer, Trotsky returned to Russia with the otherwise inexplicable connivance of the British Government and the first Jewish war-aim—the downfall of the Tsarist régime—was accomplished. Whatever the answer, again, the United States came into the war and the second Jewish war aim was well on the way to being accomplished.

Victory at Waterloo saw Rothschild triumphant. Victory in 1918 saw Jewry in every country triumphant. Many Jews on both sides had fought gallantly in the cause of their national allegiance; many more, by granting credits or by securing contracts for supplying vast commissariats, had added prodigiously to their wealth, and therefore to their political power, already amply demonstrated to all who know anything about the war's secret history. The League of Nations—typically Jewish in its inspiration, as Zangwill admitted—was set up at Geneva

and promptly recommended its member-States to return to the gold-standard. In Germany the Weimar constitution was drawn up by Jews, and under its aegis Jews enjoyed unprecedented prosperity and power: hence Hitler. In Britain the Jewish grip on multiple stores and other retail trading concerns was immeasurably strengthened, as was their whole social and political influence. Only in the realm of pure finance (if I may use such a term!) did Jewish influence in Britain diminish—though certainly not relatively to Gentile influence—and that was because the war had seen the transference of financial power from this country to America: financial Jewry had shifted its H.Q. across the Atlantic. Thereafter Britain's world-power rapidly declined. I think I am right in saying that we emerged from the last war with the largest Air Force in the world, with the most formidable Navy and with the most magnificent Army. What is more, we had an Empire of 500,000,000 people with which to maintain our relative lead. All in vain! The supreme leverage of Money-Power had deserted our shores, and in consequence our decline began. It would be ludicrous to place the onus of this decline on British Jews, of course, but if any of them endeavoured to stem it I do not know their names. A close study of events between the two wars convinced me that most of the leading British Jewish interests were on the side, consciously or unconsciously, of national and Imperial disintegration. Finally, to round off this brief sketch of Jewry's position after 1918, the Jews were in virtually sole control of the Russian peoples. Thus, through the twin power-agencies of international socialism and international capitalism, Jewry was potentially the strongest single force in the globe, and if for any reason the Jews had decided to drop their sectional differences to unite in the pursuit of a common interest their power would have been formidable indeed, though

perhaps less so after the fall of Trotsky. Even then, however, the identification of financial Jewry with communist, socialist and pseudo-socialist movements elsewhere has continued and progressed down to the present day. The identification is so marked that I wonder why Jews deny it. Not long ago, for instance, Mr. Sydney Saloman, that able and indefatigable propagandist on behalf of British Jewry, wrote a letter to the Journal of the Institute of Journalists in which he held up to derision the notion that a Jew could be a capitalist and a communist at the same time. Yet who stage-managed and financed the Russian Revolution? Who, in the process, manipulated the American and British Governments to facilitate the passage to Russia of Trotsky and the professional revolutionaries of New York? Furthermore, when the Dutch Ambassador at Moscow reported the full facts of the Jewish participation in the October Revolution, and the British Foreign Office, in a moment of absent-mindedness, brought out a White Paper publishing the report in full, at whose instigation was that White Paper instantly withdrawn and replaced by another, identical except for the omission of all reference to Jewry? To my mind such power is a damned unhealthy business, especially as it is unquestionably organized—or capable at any time of being organized for *ad hoc* purposes—on an international scale. I do not assert that Jews are incapable of great devotion to the countries of their adoption, but I do maintain that to many of them Jewish interests—no doubt very properly from the Jewish point of view—represent a prior call upon their allegiance, and that in any conflict between national and Jewish loyalties the latter will almost unfailingly win. Palestine is an example. There is no Briton, as far as I know, who would not willingly see the Jews enter into sovereign possession of Palestine but for a sense of obligation towards the Arabs and an aware-



ness of the crucial importance of British relations with the Moslem world. On the other hand I know of no British Zionist who cares a straw about this vital British interest, or who would not willingly kick it aside in order to attain the fulfilment of his dream. What is more, there is evidence which would indicate that some of the more powerful associates of the Zionist cause are not themselves very impressed with the Zionist dream: they use Zionism merely as another instrument in their unceasing bid for international power. However, you will have much more information than I have on this last point, and it will be interesting to learn if the hypothesis here outlined is correct.

I would like to conclude this chapter with the same sort of rapid glimpse into the position of World Jewry in the twentieth century as Sidonia gave into that position a hundred years ago. In the last war, as I have said, Lloyd George was surrounded by Jews. Some years before, the Zionists obtained his professional services as a lawyer, and later they secured his public services as well. Across the Atlantic Woodrow Wilson was also surrounded by Jews, one of whom boasted that he was the most powerful man in America. The late President Roosevelt had an equally large number of Jews in his circle. So has President Truman. What of Mr. Churchill, the "lifelong friend of Zionism"? Here are some glimpses into Mr. Churchill's identification with Jewish interests:

*Jewish Chronicle*, 1904.

"He (Mr. Nathan Laski, at a meeting of Manchester Jews held to protest against the Aliens Act) had interviewed Mr. Winston Churchill, who had seen Lord Rothschild with reference to the Bill, and the result was that Mr. Churchill was practically leading the attack on the Bill in Grand Committee."

*Mr. S. Gelberg in the Jewish Chronicle, 15th December, 1905.*

“Mr. Churchill’s inclusion in the Government is an additional guarantee, if any were needed, of the friendliness of the new Ministry in its relations with Jews, whether the question be the treatment of aliens or the provision of an asylum for the refugees from darkest Europe.”

*Jewish Chronicle, 15th December, 1905.*

“Mr. Winston Churchill’s splendid fight in Grand Committee against the first Aliens’ bill will long linger in the recollection of those who witnessed it.”

*Manchester Guardian, 21st April, 1908.*

“He (Mr. Nathan Laski) said candidly that in spite of anything Mr. Joynson-Hicks might say he was first and foremost a Jew; and in spite of his life-long adhesion to Liberalism, if Mr. Churchill had not satisfied him on the questions which they had put to him as Jews, he would not have been on his platform that day. It was because he was able to get more from Mr. Churchill than from Mr. Joynson-Hicks that he supported Mr. Churchill.”

*Jewish Chronicle, 17th December, 1909.*

“He (Sir Stuart Samuel) regretted that, despite the fact of the entire Cabinet being in favour of the reduction of the naturalization fee, Mr. Gladstone did not see his way to do so. He, however, assured them, amidst applause, that he had reason to believe that the next Home Secretary (Churchill) would not be averse to the reduction.”

*Jewish World, 10th June, 1910.*

“A victory at last! After nearly four years’ ceaseless agitation. . . . A great victory has been won against the Aliens Act. . . .”

The Home Secretary (Churchill) deserves our warmest thanks; he had nobly fulfilled his pledges, and at the earliest opportunity. For ourselves, we never doubted his sincerity."

*Mr. Winston Churchill, as reported in the Daily Telegraph, 19th January, 1926.*

"Almost continuously in my political life I have been in friendly relations with the Jewish community."

I do not blame Jewry for finding for themselves such firm friends as Britain's two great War Ministers, and it is certainly not my argument that these British leaders, in befriending Jewry, were doing anything outside the limits of the Liberal Party's official policy. It is understandable that when Lloyd George supplanted Asquith and that when Mr. Churchill took over from Neville Chamberlain both should have received Jewish backing. You may say, of course, that if British Jewry had a hand in replacing Chamberlain with Churchill they served the nation well, since thereby a great war-leader came into his own. That is not the point. If Jewish influence is strong enough to be decisive for good, it is also strong enough to be decisive for evil. I have already given one instance—Palestine—where a Jewish policy has been harmful to British interests. Another was the Jewish weapon of the gold-standard re-introduced by the British Government in 1925. Before it took that calamitous step it must, surely, have been in the closest touch with Jewish financial circles, and acted largely on their advice.

My charge is not one of Jewish corruption, but of an all-pervasive Jewish atmosphere, strong enough to exert on occasion a decisive effect on the destinies of men. This state of affairs was sufficiently disquieting even in the days when British and Jewish interests went hand-in-hand; now that Britain's star is no longer in the ascendant, and

Jewish financial power has established itself so firmly in the United States, it seems to me clear that if the British Empire is to survive we shall be obliged to insulate ourselves from the electric currents of Jewish power-politics. Even if there were no longer a direct relationship between Jewish finance and the various communist and socialist movements in the world, even if Jews working for capitalism and Jews working for socialism no longer had a common meeting ground, we should require to examine the Jewish activities thus isolated to determine whether they were helping or retarding the cause of Britain's survival as a great Power.

Here is an illustration of my meaning. There is in the United States of America at the present time a disguised expansionist ferment destined to find expression to an ever increasing extent in the domination of the world's markets. The American Jewish financiers certainly will not object, for they must see in American nationalism—yes, and in American Imperialism however disguised—a weapon admirably suited to their purpose. Similarly Russia has taken advantage of the chaos of the times greatly to extend her own power, and here again Jews who favour the Soviet system will be found—even in the British Parliament—actively encouraging Soviet expansion. Both the American and the Russian movements are nationalist in aspiration and aim, despite the fact that the Jews in each are likely to look upon them as instruments for securing their own international ends. This, you will appreciate, is to leave out of account all theories that the capitalist and socialist ends are one and the same: I am content to believe that the Jews of New York and the Jews who support Moscow, at the moment, at least, are not in any kind of collusion. The point is that East and West the Jews are supporting very strong nationalist movements, whereas in Britain they are doing nothing of

the kind. Here they are very busily employed in backing avowed internationalist policies which can only lead to the weakening of national Britain in relation to national Russia and national America, and eventually to her complete subordination to either or both. You may reply that many Englishmen are doing the same thing, and I must agree, though with this reservation—that the English internationalists are woolly-minded people, whereas the woolly-minded Jew is indeed a rare phenomenon. The truth of the matter is probably that where a nation's star is in the ascendant the Jews will "muscle-in" on its power and prosperity, whereas when a nation has entered upon a decline the Jews feel impelled to exploit that situation, too.

It is very difficult, however, thus to isolate Jewish activity in one's mind. Since for some purposes the Jews are internationally organized the suspicion is always present that the same international co-operation exists for other purposes. The suspicion may be groundless, but it is there. Let me take, as an example, the Final Act of Bretton Woods, which, as you know, was drawn up to ensure the continuance of the present international financial system, and which, in its effect, would put the economy of every country under the virtual dictatorship of Wall Street, providing for a return to the gold standard, but making no provision for the repayment of international debt by American acceptance of the debtor country's goods and services. The Final Act of Bretton Woods allowed instead—where there was no gold for refunding purposes—for the seizure of the debtor country's capital assets—in other words, the age-long technique of Jewish usury is to be applied to entire nations, a prospect to which Britain, as the largest debtor nation, cannot look forward with relish. The Bretton Woods plan was largely the work of two Jews, Messrs. Morgenthau and White. Now—and this is my point—when the late Lord Keynes

wrote to *The Times* begging Britain to accept the proposals, one imagines that his motive was to make the best of a bad business lest worse should befall, but when a British Jew passionately pleads for that acceptance, as one has done, to prove our "gratitude to America", one wonders whether the distinction between British national interests and Jewish international interests is very clear in his mind. There may be no justification for any such anxiety, but the anxiety remains.

A.K.C.

## Legends About the Jews

MY DEAR CHESTERTON,

In sending me your two new chapters you say in your covering letter: "If you think anything I have written is nonsense, I do hope that you will say so. This must be a completely honest book." Well, a lot of what you have written is nonsense. You say yourself that you found Chapter V "extraordinarily difficult to write, as it is so easy to become bogged in distinguishing between sense and nonsense about Jewish power". You repudiate "the extravagant theories of the 'ideological' anti-semites, who build round their anti-semitism an astonishing edifice of black and white magic, founded upon the Protocols of the Elders of Zion", which you are "disposed to dismiss as the work of gravely disordered minds". Yet you go on to put to me seriously arguments which come straight out of that same "astonishing edifice" of nonsense which your "ideological" anti-semites have founded upon the Protocols.

L. Fry's *Waters Flowing Eastward*, which has the same format and comes from the same Paris printer as other publications on "The Jewish Question" issued by Leese's "Imperial Fascist League" ("No connection with Sir Oswald Mosley's pro-Jewish Organization") is the kind of book one would expect to contain the story you quote from it about Colonel Goldsmid; but I can't find it there. It is however (and it is all evidence of the quality of your reading on "The Jewish Question") in the Introduction to the English translation of the *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*.

Colonel Goldsmid was not "a Jew brought up as a Christian". He was born a Christian, of a branch of the

Goldsmid family that had gone over to Christianity and adopted a military career. It gave the British army several Generals, including Major-General Albert Goldsmid who was, as a young officer, at Waterloo, and Colonel Goldsmid's uncle, Major-General Sir Frederick Goldsmid. He himself served in India and in the South African War. He married in India a grand-daughter of Lieut.-General Sir J. Hunter-Littler, and when he decided to become a Jew, his wife became a Jewess, and their children were brought up as Jews. There was no secrecy about it. "I am an orthodox Jew", he told Herzl at their first meeting, "and my children are given a strictly religious education." He was also a Zionist, and he was interested in Herzl's ideas. But he was first of all a British soldier. "Loyalty to the flag for which the sun once stood still can only deepen our devotion to the flag on which the sun never sets," he said.

I can find nothing in Herzl's diaries about "Goldsmid suggesting to Herzl that the best way of expropriating the English Aristocracy and so destroying their power to protect the people of England against Jew domination was to put excessive taxes on the land." It belongs to the realm of the inventions of the Protocols. The English aristocrats and the people of England were not under discussion. And there is nothing at all in the diaries about Herzl thinking this "an excellent idea", and, by implication, embodying it "in Protocol No. 6".

I know a good deal about Herzl's life and character, and I confess to a feeling of shame that I should have to waste time to clear him of the absurd charge of ever having anything to do with that silly hotch-potch called the Protocols. Read *Protocol No. 6*, and read anything written by Herzl.

I have looked up what Herzl does say in his diaries about his talk with Colonel Goldsmid (whom he had



never met before, had heard of for the first time only a month previously, and whom he failed to win for his political Zionism, which the Colonel, a "Lover of Zion" found "too radical").

Herzl says: "His idea is good, to hit at large land-ownership by means of a progressive land-tax. Henry George!" That is all. And the whole thing had no reference to England, but to Palestine, and to preventing the land there falling into the hands of a few big estate-owners. This idea is Mosaic, and Henry George, the modern apostle of the Single-Tax acknowledges it. But Henry George was not a Jew, and his Single-Tax movement has Jewish and non-Jewish supporters and opponents. Lloyd George was one of his supporters, and introduced the land-tax in this country in his 1909 Budget.

You attribute the decay of the English aristocracy to "the Jews—or rather a number of influential Jews acting in unison". "To-day there is no aristocracy in England", you say, "only a plutocratic simulacrum possessing few if any of the distinctive British virtues." Will you tell me how many Jews there were among the Chartists, who drew their inspiration largely from Paine's "Rights of Man", and what your "influential Jews acting in unison" had to do with their People's Charter, and with its principles, including this: "That all hereditary distinctions of birth are unnatural and opposed to the equal rights of man; and therefore ought to be abolished." It was Carlyle who told us that Chartism was born of that "sick discontent" in which England had for a century or more lain "writhing powerless on its fever-bed, dark, nigh desperate", bringing "sullen, revengeful humour of revolt against the upper classes".

Was John Bright a Jew, who said: "They sometimes think we are too hard upon the aristocracy. They think

that the vast population of Lancashire and Yorkshire are democratic and turbulent. But there are no elements there, except that of great numbers, which are to be compared in their dangerous character with the elements of disaffection and insubordination which exist round about the halls and castles of this proud and arrogant aristocracy. You have seen in the papers, within the last fortnight, that the foul and frightful crime of incendiarism has again appeared. It always shows itself when we have had for some short time a high price of bread." What had Jews to do with the Corn-laws? Or with the Corn-law riots? And with the coming of the Reform Bill, with which we associate the name of Earl Grey? What "influential Jews" were Asquith, Lloyd George, and Earl Grey's kinsman, Sir Edward Grey, who led the crusade against the House of Lords in 1909? "What is the House of Lords?" Sir Edward asked in one of his speeches. "What claim and what title has it to influence and respect?"

"'It is so old', they say about the House of Lords, and hence, they argue, so virtuous", Harold Spender wrote in an official Liberal Party publication at that time. "But does it follow? On the contrary, we generally find the oldest aristocracies the worst. The French nobility had been kept far more strenuously pure than that of these islands. And yet they were the most corrupt and selfish aristocracy of modern times and led France where we should be loth to see England led. But is the House of Lords so very old? Its composition is essentially modern. There are seven peerages of the thirteenth century, eight of the fourteenth, six of the fifteenth, sixteen of the sixteenth, fifty of the seventeenth, 101 of the eighteenth, 290 of the nineteenth. If the House of Lords were limited to descendants of peerages founded before the seventeenth century it would consist of twenty-one. If we had to depend upon the Peers whose titles date from the twelfth

and eleventh century we should have no House of Lords at all. It is to the paltry favourites of the Georges and Stuarts, and of the nominees of modern ministers, instead of the more picturesque Normans and Saxons that we are asked to bow down."

This is not the place for me to take sides in the battle of Lords and Commons. But I do want to bring you back to the realization that it is a native English quarrel, and that your talk about it being instigated by Herzl and Colonel Goldsmid and the wicked "influential Jews" is nonsense. I might quote at this point your namesake, G. K. Chesterton, who has an essay in one of his books about a certain "cheap imperial organ, the *Daily Wire*", which was writing "very solemnly", "It is easy for the Radicals to make jokes about the dukes. Very few of these revolutionary gentlemen have given to the poor one half of the earnest thought, tireless unselfishness, and truly Christian patience that are given to them by the great landlords of this country. We are very sure that the English people, with their sturdy commonsense, will prefer to be in the hands of English gentlemen rather than in the miry claws of Socialistic buccaneers." You know what G.K.C. thought of that kind of clap-trap. He has another essay about a gentleman he met in a club, who talked a similar kind of nonsense to him, and he calls that gentleman "a deadly public danger—A Fool".

Colonel Goldsmid may have been a supporter of Henry George's Land-Tax idea, but Herzl's biographer, Jacob de Haas, is not so sure about Herzl. "In a vague way", he writes, "Herzl opposed profiteering from land speculation. He was acquainted with Henry George's Single-Tax theory, favoured the progressive taxation of the land, but avoided accepting so radical a theory. He was an individualist."

I hope you don't expect me to undertake an examina-

tion of Henry George's social ideas and to declare myself his follower or opponent. Either way, it would no more bind every other Jew than the letter in *The Times*, "that faced with a choice between the policies outlined by Mr. Eden and Sir Stafford Cripps, there can be no real doubt as to what the Christian must do", binds all Christians.

But I wonder what Henry George would have said about the idiotic notion of identifying his "glorious vision of want destroyed, the culmination of Christianity", with a sinister Jewish plot "to deprive the Goyim of their land". And you say that the question of the authenticity or otherwise of the Protocols seems to you of little importance.

What Herzl and Colonel Goldsmid discussed was the question of the Single Tax in relation to the Jewish land to be established, and not in relation to England. Zangwill has something more to say on this subject. Joseph Fels was a rich American Jew, who was an ardent follower of Henry George. "I had never heard of Joseph Fels," Zangwill writes, "until he walked into my office unannounced and unheralded, and offered me a hundred thousand dollars." Zangwill was the President of the Ito, which had been formed after he had broken away from the Zionist Organization, and which was seeking a territory for Jewish settlement outside Palestine. "What Mr. Fels wanted", Zangwill explains, "was that the State to be brought into being should be established on a Single Tax basis. Sympathetically disposed as I was towards land nationalization, and still more towards Ito capitalization", he goes on, "I was unable to pledge the organization to the Henry Georgian principle, because it was impossible to foresee the circumstances and conditions under which the desired tract of territory would become attainable—if indeed it would become attainable at all in a world ruled by unreason and the sword. Our first

business was to obtain a territory. For Fels the first business was to single-tax it. The single-tax is, after all," Zangwill proceeds, "only a fiscal expedient which would lessen the financial burdens of the landless, and even if it increased production and thus diminished poverty positively as well as negatively, poverty is alas only one of the many roots of human misery, and were all the prisons, brothels, ugly women and blighted children due to it eliminated, I can imagine these phenomena persisting—if in smaller numbers—in a world of general comfort. It was not poverty that Sodom and Gomorrah suffered from." In the same spirit Zangwill writes elsewhere: "If Socialism encroaches too far upon individual liberty not all its loaves and fishes will save it."

No, Chesterton, "the notion that Jewish interests are Jesuitically federated or that Jewish financiers use their power for Jewish ends is one of the most ironic of myths. Their only unity is negative—that unity imposed by the hostile hereditary vision of the ubiquitous Haman. They live in symbiosis with every other people, each group surrendered to its own local fortunes." Zangwill has summed up the position in that passage.

As for those Protocols, Zangwill "happened to be at all the sittings of the Zionist Congress held at Basle in 1897", whose proceedings are supposed to have been recorded in the Protocols. "Nothing could be less like the operations of a Jewish Jesuitry", he writes, "than this gathering, which laid the foundations of the Zionist movement and formulated its programme as 'the acquisition of a publicly, legally recognized home for the Jewish people in Palestine'. As this was an absolutely new movement in Jewry, initiated in spite of great public opposition, by a few more or less impecunious publicists, it seems indeed a strange manifestation on the part of the secret Semitic gang that ran—and runs—all the papers, parliaments

and banks of the world. Such forgeries appear in troubled periods, they are a stock historical weapon—though rarely has a forger admitted in more Irish fashion that he cannot prove the authenticity of his documents, for—he gravely explains—the essence of this criminal plot is secrecy!”

You use the very same argument—“the essence of a secret Government is—secrecy,” you write. What good is anything I say if you take your stand on something so impalpable? If, as you admit, you are “not prepared to assert that such a body exists”, what is it all about?

“As one, the best years of whose life have been sacrificed to the vain attempt to bring about Jewish solidarity; as one who has been in intimate touch with the leading Elders of Zion throughout the world; as one present at the first Zionist Congress at which the conspiracy is alleged to have been hatched, I say that whoever has honestly believed in these Elders of Zion and their fantastic conspiracy is a fool,” writes Zangwill, “and whosoever shall continue to repeat this accusation to which I hereby give the lie is a reckless and incorrigible rogue.”

You say I admit that Jews take a hand in international finance. I know very little about finance, international or otherwise, and I am afraid I am not to be quoted as an authority. I have read a few books on the subject, and I have found that some of them speak with a good deal of respect of the great bankers and financiers, and that they are by no means all Jews. Others attack the international financiers, and again, these are not all Jews.

It seems to me that if we have international trade, the exchange of products which one country has and another has not, you must have some form of regulating the exchange, and international trade requires the international banker. The trouble is not his existence, but whether he wields excessive power. The last book I read was very

bitter about the international character of the Bank of England, and spoke of its Governor, Montagu Norman, as the high priest of the cult. There was also much talk there of the Cunliffes and of other very distinguished English families of "international bankers". "No doubt there are also Semitic snarks and Hebrew Boojums," says Zangwill. But it's the snarks and the Boojums we have to deal with, whatever else they are. If international finance is a bad thing, action must be taken against international finance and the international financiers, including of course those of them who are Jews. I have no shares in the Rothschild bank. And I can't see why I should have to answer for their affairs, except that they are always being used as a pretext for attacking Jews who are neither involved nor benefit in any way by what they do.

I know that the Rothschilds have been made a kind of symbol of the Jews, as though every Jew were privy to all their transactions and "one Jewish millionaire causes a thousand times more Jew-hatred than ten thousand Jewish paupers," says the Editor of the *Jewish Chronicle*. But the City of London and the Stock Exchange were not their creation, and there was a time when no Jew was eligible for membership of the Stock Exchange. The legend of the "Jewish usurer" needs examination. Even in medieval days there were others. The Lombards, who gave their name to the money-market were Christians, the Fuggers were Christians, so were the Bardi and the Peruggi, and the usurers of Cahors. The merchants of London loaned money, and one of them was Dick Whittington. Jacques Coeur, the great merchant banker of France had branches and agents abroad. The Medici rose to sovereign power by way of commerce and banking.

The Habsburgs too seem to have had strong trading instincts. "The outstanding trait of the Habsburgs was

that they acquired and ruled lands and peoples as they would have private enterprises. They were Germans, but had no country; they were just a family. The Habsburg monarchy has never been anything but a complex of properties belonging to a group of relatives with an insatiable desire for business expansion. The Habsburg House was willing to acquire anything—Lombardy or part of Poland, it did not matter—completely unconcerned with the manifold differences between different nationalities.” I am quoting from *The Story of South-Eastern Europe* by Stoyan Privichevich. Most Royal families have those international connections of which you speak, uncles and cousins of different nationalities, and so also have many old noble families and nowadays big business dynasties. What you have noted about the Rothschilds is not an exclusively “Jewish” appearance.

I don't know whether the fact that the Rockefellers did not operate through members of the same family settled in different parts of the world lessened the international power of the Standard Oil Company and its subsidiaries. Agents are just as capable. And concern at the ramifications of the international cartels is not confined to those which are family businesses. I believe though that there are also non-Jewish businesses which pursue the same method as the Rothschilds of placing members of the family in different capitals. There are for instance the Schroeders who, in Germany, helped Hitler to power, and in England, where their banking house has been established since 1804, the family is English. There are others. I have come across a reference to the Schicht family, connected with the Unilever Company, one brother in Germany having been a supporter of Hitler and an important man in the German war industry, while the other brother, in England is a British subject. “We are willing to believe”, says the paper which carries the story, “that George



Schicht will in future act in complete independence of his brother, but. . . ." The Siemens come into the same category. It is a consequence not of being Jews or Christians, but of being financiers and bankers and big businessmen. Much more is needed if you want to deal with these problems than to shout "Jew".

I read in a London daily that behind a number of big companies in England, America and elsewhere was Count Volpi, once Italy's richest man and Mussolini's friend, "a riddle of international finance". One of the big German trusts is the I.G. Farbenindustrie, and I see in one paper that "the Farbenindustrie directors claimed during their interrogation that they have friends in Britain and the U.S.A. and that when these friends arrive in Germany the investigation into the activities of German industrial and financial trusts will cease." *The Times* has a long report from Washington of a statement made by Mr. William Clayton, the Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, who says that the State Department has abundant evidence that the Nazis, in anticipation of military defeat, made plans to carry on in foreign countries a wide range of activities necessary to support an eventual resurgence of German power. I see a reference to International Com-bines in the report. The Nazis surely will not have entrusted their affairs to "Jewish international finance".

The fact is that the love of money, avarice, is, as Ruskin says, "the sin of the whole world". Although Buckle, writing about the same time, was not so sure of "the sinfulness of loving money. The love of money, like all our appetites", he said, "is liable to abuse, but it is to the love of money that we owe all trade and commerce; in other words, the possession of every comfort which our own country is unable to supply. If theologians could succeed in their desire to destroy that love we should relapse into comparative barbarism."

I am neither an economist, nor a theologian, so I shall not argue the point. But I do know that the trade of the merchant is not peculiar to the Jew. Chaucer describes him. "This marchaund up into his countour hous goth he, to reckyn with himself, as well may be, how that it with him stood, and if that he encresced were or noon. For riche was his tresor and his hord." Bunyan's Mr. Worldly-Wiseman is the ancestor of Galsworthy's "Man of Property", and his Lord Time-Server, Mr. Facing Both Ways and Mr. Anything have their counterparts to-day. Swift's Yahoos, for which he "had so utter an hatred and contempt", were the Englishmen around him. Do you know Maupassant? "I should add that there are undoubtedly charming Englishmen; I have often met them. But they are rarely our fellow-guests at hotels." And here is a German, Canon Riem, writing of this country in 1795: "On the whole the British nation consists of merchants, people drawing dividends, a very small modicum of scholars, and a host of civil servants, peasants and sailors. Commerce spoils their character, bringing with it the vices of greed and selfishness."

Cecil Rhodes was not a Jew, though some of the smaller men round him were. "Rhodes was quite prepared to admit brazenly—not merely brazenly but boastfully—that he was doing things through his money. 'I have tried to combine the commercial with the imaginative.' He believed that money could bring about the millenium. Again and again he explains to Stead that his lever for raising mankind is money. Money was his Pegasus, and he knew it. 'One is called a speculator', he told his Chartered audience when he faced them for the first time in England. 'I do not deny the charge. If one has ideas one cannot carry them out without having wealth at one's back.' It was a thing he often said—and with a bluntness that was deliberate."

Herzl records in his diaries that when Stead approached Rhodes on his behalf, with the idea of the Jewish State, "Rhodes said, 'If he wants any tip from me, I've only one word to say, and that is: "Let him put money in his purse"'—which was very characteristic of Rhodes."

Altogether this idea of "Jewish money power" and "Jewish usury" needs examination. I have said that Jews were not the only usurers, and that even in medieval days there were a great many powerful Christian usurers. But the *tu quoque* is not enough. Of course, in any human pursuit you will find people engaged who belong to all the different groups and sections of mankind. But it is also necessary to consider the circumstances which compel particular groups of people to undertake certain activities. It cannot be shown that the Jews who came out of Palestine after the overthrow of the Jewish State or the Jews who lived after that in Babylon or Rome were traders and financiers. When the Roman Empire broke up world trade was in the hands of the Arabs and Persians. The Jews had been mostly agriculturists and artisans. It was the new European feudal order, in which the Jews had no place, because they were not Christians, that deprived them of their land and forced them into trade and finance. If all pursuits are open to them Jews will not concentrate more than other human beings do in certain specialized occupations. Jews don't run all to a pattern. They have differing tastes and aptitudes, and an understanding of money transactions is not given to them all.

Even the history of those early periods is not altogether clear. Dr. Cecil Roth for instance is "now certain that beneath the ruling caste of medieval financiers in England there was a proletariat engaged in the most varied and least expected operations, including soldiers, crossbow-makers and minstrels. It is becoming clear too that medieval Anglo-Jewish intellectual life was not so arid a

desert as its detractors used to claim." I can't say, but I certainly feel inclined to agree that all Jews, even in medieval days, could not have confined themselves to money operations. Many of them would have made a very poor showing at it.

As for your story about Rothschild being the real victor of Waterloo, Lucien Wolf went very thoroughly into this, "the most widely disseminated of all the Rothschild myths". "The story briefly", he writes, "is that in order to deceive the Stock Exchange, Nathan Rothschild followed Wellington to the field of Waterloo, and that when he saw which way the battle was going, he posted to London, depressed the market with hints of disaster, secretly bought the depressed stock and thus managed to 'scoop' several millions sterling when the official news arrived. The story of this fraudulent operation is a pure invention from beginning to end. It was quite unknown to Nathan Rothschild's contemporaries and biographers, and even to the pamphleteers who delighted in vilifying him. It first appeared in an anti-semitic brochure published in Paris in 1846, the author of which was a shady journalist named Georges Dirnuaell, who had conceived the idea of blackmailing the head of the Paris firm. He first submitted his manuscript to the Baron James and asked for a sum of money for its suppression, and when this impudent proposal was rejected he resorted to publication. The pamphlet made some little stir and Baron James was stung into publishing a reply, in which he told the story of the attempted chantage. In this reply he specifically denied the allegation that his brother Nathan was in Belgium or anywhere near the seat of war at the time of the battle. At New Court all the facts about how the news of Wellington's victory was received—for it is true that Rothschild was the first to receive it, though he did not bring it—have been preserved. It remains to say a few words about the

more serious and generic charge that he kept his news secret and deceived the money market. He sent both his messages to Downing Street as soon as he received them. The arrival of his messengers was well known in the City, and the whole story was actually told in the *London Courier* of 21st June. As for the allegation that he depressed the stock market by hinting at a British disaster in order to be able to buy stock at a low price before official news arrived, the truth is that he had bought largely and openly in face of an incredulous and falling market."

I find it recorded in several other authorities that "the tradition that Rothschild gained largely by keeping the news of the result of Waterloo secret is entirely mythical". It is also stated that "Rothschild never lost faith in the ultimate overthrow of Napoleon, on which he staked his all". Suppose Napoleon had not been overthrown, what would have happened to his all?

The origin of the Rothschild wealth may have been tainted, as I suppose all great wealth is tainted, but it seems that the taint first derived from a Christian Prince, the Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel, who obtained the treasury he entrusted for safe keeping to the founder of the Rothschild House by selling his Hessians to George III to fight against the American Revolution. "It began", says Henry George, "in the blood money received by this petty tyrant from greater tyrants as the price of the lives of his subjects." Will you defend the Landgrave, that I should defend Rothschild? Jews are not silent about it. Jacob de Haas's *Jewish Encyclopedia* says: "Mayer Amshel Rothschild was general agent and afterwards Court banker for William IX, Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel, whose great fortune was acquired by hiring his Hessian troops as mercenaries to the British in the American Revolutionary War."

I should add that not all the Rothschilds are bankers.

The late Lord Rothschild was a naturalist, who devoted his life to natural history and was not in the family business. Nor is his successor, the present Lord Rothschild, who is a scientist, and has received the George Medal for his war services.

You quote Napoleon in 1806 against the Jews. Your quotation seems to have been taken from L. Fry's *Waters Flowing Eastward*, but you will find the same thing in the Jewish source books. The *Jewish Encyclopedia*, for instance. And the Marx-Margolis *History of the Jewish People* says: "Napoleon was little edified by the spectacle of small Jewish traders following his armies to buy up the soldiers' loot. On the occasion of his visit to Strassburg, shortly before the battle of Austerlitz (1805), he gave ear to the complaints of the enemies of the Jews, unreconciled as they were to Jewish equality, about the extortionate practices of Jewish money-lenders in Alsace. In a rescript dated 30th May, 1806, Napoleon suspended for a year the payment of all debts held by Jews against agriculturists in the eastern departments. At the same time he gave orders for calling a 'Jewish States General', to be followed by a second assembly, the resuscitated ancient Sanhedrin, for the purpose of accepting carefully prepared organic articles which should do away with usury."

Napoleon seems to have been able to change his opinions about lots of things, as it suited him. On this Jewish question, for instance, he spoke against the Jews in the Imperial Council of 30th April, 1806, and a week later in the same Council he declared himself against any persecution of the Jews. What concerned him most was their loyalty to the State, which was himself. When the Jewish Assembly he convoked met in 1806, he put to the representatives of the Jews a number of questions, among them "whether the Jews in France consider France their Fatherland and recognize the duty of defending it", which

“was answered by a rising vote and the spontaneous cry: ‘Aye, even unto death!’” Napoleon is regarded by the Jews of Europe as their emancipator. “It was unfortunate”, complains a Zionist writer, Professor Norman Bentwich, “that the admission of European Jews to civil and political activity in the modern nation-State, which took the place of the Church-State, was made conditional by the emancipator, Napoleon Bonaparte, on their renouncing the belief that they were a separate nation. Jews by religion, Frenchmen by nationality was the principle.”

This is the Zionist objection, after the event. But there were Jews at the time who were not enthusiastic about Napoleon’s emancipation of the Jews. There was one great Rabbi in Russia, Rabbi Shneur Zalman, who “was unfavourable to Napoleon, whose gift of civil rights, he thought, might lead to a disintegration of the religious life. Civic rightlessness under Alexander, so long as it preserved inviolability of Judaism was preferable. Jewish fidelity to the Russian cause was attested by the Governors of the Western provinces, which constituted the actual theatre of the war.”

You see, the Jews were again divided on this issue, the Western Jews with Napoleon, the Russian and the British Jews against him, as their countries were. Rothschild, you remember, “staked his all on the ultimate overthrow of Napoleon”.

Yet Napoleon was not only the emancipator of the Jews, but he had at one time toyed with the idea of a Jewish restoration in Palestine. It was at the time he was aiming at the conquest of Egypt, Palestine and Syria, and he thought the Jews would rally to his cause. All Napoleon’s approaches to the Jewish question and to other questions appear to have been dictated by one consideration—expediency. He was friendly to the Jews or unfriendly as

suited his purpose at the moment. I should take no deep beliefs on the Jewish question from Napoleon. "I find in him no such sincerity as in Cromwell", is Carlyle's verdict on Napoleon. "'False as a bulletin' became a proverb in Napoleon's time", he reminds us. And he concludes: "This poor Napoleon believed too much in the duplicity of men."

You find little evidence, you say, of Jewish influences playing any considerable part in instigating the French Revolution. But the same causes brought the French Revolution which brought the Russian Revolution, in which Jews did play a part, though nothing like so predominant a part as you suggest. "The measure of the Iniquity, then, of the Falsehood which has been gathering through long centuries, is nearly full. Against the King's Government who is not bitter?" writes Carlyle. "To it all men and bodies of men are become as enemies; it is the centre whereon infinite contentions unite and clash. Inevitable; it is the breaking up of a World-Solescism, worn out at last, down even to bankruptcy of money." And Buckle likewise: "The measure of that age was now full. The upper classes, intoxicated by the long possession of power had provoked the crisis; and it was needful that they should abide the issue. The only question that remained was to see whether they who had raised the storm could ride the whirlwind." Surely that is also true of the Russian Revolution. And there is no need to seek a hidden Jewish hand to account for the breaking up of a World-Solescism, such as Czarist Russia had become, "worn out at last, down even to bankruptcy of money".

"No nation was less prepared for war than Russia in 1914," I read. "The Czar was timid and vague-minded to the point of inanity. His actions were determined from day to day by the Czarina, who in her turn, was dominated by Rasputin. In December, 1916 there was a con-



spiracy of noblemen against Rasputin, and he was murdered. But his murder was not enough to restore confidence. Case after case of inefficiency and mal-administration became known. The feeling of mistrust spread. Every day brought reports of increased numbers of desertions from the front (it is said that over a million Russian soldiers deserted in January, 1917). Every week the cost of living rose in the cities, and the people were brought nearer to starvation. Suddenly Petrograd was startled by a revolt. The Cossacks were ordered out against the strikers, but the Cossacks showed sympathy with them. There was a strong revolutionary organization in existence in Petrograd, but it was almost as much surprised as the Government by the March Revolution."

It is not a Jewish historian who writes: "The Russian autocracy was dishonest and incompetent. Indolence and scoundrelism mismanaged the war. The Russian soldiers were sent into battle without guns to support them, without even rifle ammunition. For a time they seemed to be suffering mutely as the beasts suffer, but there is a limit to the endurance even of the most ignorant. A profound disgust for the Czardom was creeping through these armies of betrayed and wasted men. From the close of 1915 onwards Russia was a source of deepening anxiety to her Western allies. Throughout 1916 she remained largely on the defensive, and there were rumours of a separate peace with Germany." Lloyd George's memoirs bear out the story of Russia's military collapse. Sir George Buchanan, the British Ambassador in Moscow, Bruce Lockhart and other observers on the spot make quite clear what happened. Somerset Maugham, who was sent to Russia to try to keep her in the war and prevent the Bolsheviks seizing power, writes that he "came away disillusioned. The endless talk when action was needed, the insincerity and half-heartedness that I found everywhere

sickened me." General Denikin, who rose against the Bolsheviks, did not paint a pretty picture of the conditions in Russia under the Czar: "In Petrograd and Tzarskoe-Selo", he wrote, "there was woven a sticky web of mud, licentiousness and crime. The truth and fancy about the situation penetrated into the furthest corners of the country and of the army. But the most shattering impression was produced by the word Treason. This related to the Empress." Miliukov, the pro-Allied Foreign Minister, whom the Bolsheviks overthrew, says in his *History of the Second Russian Revolution*: "A band of big and small swindlers and adventurers surrounded the Tsaritsa, and used their influence to subvert the laws for money, to sell privileges and appointments, to free conscripts from military service." It was not revolutionaries, but a group of officers, princes, noblemen at Court, who assassinated Rasputin. The Revolution was not the cause of Russia's collapse. The collapse was the cause of the Revolution. Rodzianko, the Speaker of the Duma, declared "that symptoms of the decomposition of the army were visible and felt as early as the second year of the war. In the period 1915-16 the enemy had captured over two million of our soldiers and more than 1,500,000 had deserted from the front. The army is disintegrating. It is quite possible that in such circumstances the soldiers will refuse to advance, and during the coming winter will leave the trenches and abandon the battlefield."

"The Russian masses were resolute to end the war," wrote H. G. Wells, whose own sympathies were with the Kerensky "moderate" Republic, which was trying to fight on. "It led only to another great slaughtering of Russians. The limit of Russian endurance was reached. Mutinies broke out in the Russian armies and on 7th November, 1917 Kerensky's Government was overthrown and power was seized by the Soviet Government domi-

nated by the Bolshevik Socialists under Lenin, and pledged to make peace regardless of the Western Powers. Russia passed definitely out of the war."

Where are the Jews in all this? Of course, there were Jews among the Russian revolutionists, but how, with nearly six million Jews living in what was then the Russian Empire, could there have been no Jews among the Russian revolutionists, with those Jews penned in to a Pale of Settlement, cribbed and restricted, pogromed and humiliated? But they were not alone. All the peoples of the Czarist multi-national State were oppressed and downtrodden. And their revolutionists were many times larger, as befits a population of 170,000,000 compared with six million. Poles and Georgians, Ukrainians and Letts and Finns, Russians and Jews, all the peoples of the Empire contributed their quota to the revolutionary movement.

You do not think I will "deny that the Revolution, with the exception of Lenin, was Jew-led, Jew-financed and predominantly Jew-executed". At least, you do not repeat the lie that Lenin was a Jew named Zederblum. But is Stalin a Jew, was Kalinin, was Dzerzhinsky, was Lunatcharsky, Krassin or Chicherin, Rykov, Bucharin, or Tomsky, is Molotov, is Maisky?

Trotsky was a Jew, and Kamenev and Zinoviev were Jews, "but what kind of Jews are they?" Max Nordau asked in 1919. "They have disdainfully cast off Judaism. When a deputation of Petrograd Jews, with the Rabbi at their head, waited upon Trotsky, he replied icily that he was an internationalist and took not the slightest interest in Jews and Judaism." Professor Dubnov, the recognized historian of Russian Jewry, made no effort to disguise his dislike of the Soviet system. He himself left Russia, unwilling to live under the new régime. So did most of the leaders of Russian Jewry. "Lenin and Trotsky—the one a

native Russian, the other a Jew alienated from his people—stood at the head of this upheaval which destroyed Russia and the chief Jewish centre,” Dubnov wrote. He went on to recall that it was a Jew, Leonid Kannegieser, who “killed the Jew, Uritzky, the Chairman of the terrible Cheka”, and a Jewish girl, Dora Kaplan, who shot at Lenin in August 1918. “The execution of the martyrs on the altar of freedom,” he went on, “marked the beginning of the Red Terror which did not cease in Russia for several years.”

You do not need, you write, “to search for hidden motives in the action of the German Government which permitted Lenin and his associates free passage across Germany to start the Revolution. It was in Germany’s interest to push Russia out of the war. Britain’s interest, on the other hand, was to keep Russia fighting Germany. Can you tell me, Leftwich,” you ask, “why Britain, despite this vital necessity, did for Trotsky what Germany did for Lenin—granted him free passage, in this case all the way from Newfoundland?”

Well, the Revolution had started without Lenin or Trotsky being in Russia. Lenin was in Switzerland. He wanted to get back to Russia. “The Allied Powers—knowing his history—refused him transit, but Germany hoping that he would preach pacifism in Russia, allowed him to cross Germany with a number of other Russian exiles on condition that no one left or entered their coach of the train while it was on German territory.”

That is how Lenin and his group entered Russia. Trotsky would have been with him had he been in Switzerland. But Trotsky was in New York. How did he get to Russia? By Jewish intrigue, you say. It is actually “certain”, you tell me, “that the powerful Jews around Lloyd George reached an agreement with the still more powerful Jews around Wilson, one of the terms of which

was Trotsky's safe conduct." And "Trotsky returned to Russia with the otherwise inexplicable connivance of the British Government and the first Jewish war-aim—the downfall of the Czarist régime—was accomplished."

A pretty story, Chesterton, but it is not true. To begin with, Trotsky's arrival in Russia did not bring about the downfall of the Czarist régime, because it had already fallen weeks before Trotsky left New York. America at that time was still neutral, and Trotsky had no difficulty in booking his passage, with five of his colleagues, on board a ship belonging to another neutral country, Norway. "On the very day when Lenin arrived in Petrograd", Trotsky writes, "the British Naval Police removed from the Norwegian steamer *Christianifjord* six emigrants (including himself) returning from New York to Russia. These men succeeded in reaching Petrograd only on the 4th May, when the political re-arming of the Bolshevik party was, at least in outline, completed." He had been taken off the boat at Halifax, and he was released at the demand of the Russian Government which held office until the Bolshevik Revolution in November overthrew it, and placed Lenin at the head of the new régime.

"'Who knows?' said one of the British officers at Halifax. 'If we had kept Trotsky here perhaps the war would have been over long ago, and history might have taken a different course. We wanted to hold him, but Miliukov and Kerensky insisted upon our releasing him.'"

So there you have your Jews and your Jewish conspiracy. Miliukov and Kerensky.

Incidentally, in making so much of Trotsky's part in the Soviet Revolution this British officer at Halifax and you are running counter to accepted Soviet history, which links Lenin only with Stalin, "Lenin's closest colleague", as the twin organizers of the Revolution against Kerensky and the twin shapers of the Soviet State. Certainly, before

Trotsky had arrived back in Russia, Stalin was delivering speeches supporting Lenin's anti-war activity. "We are opposed to the war", Stalin said, "because it is a predatory war, a war of conquest. We are for peace, because it provides the surest way out of economic chaos and food shortage. There is no bread because of the shortage of labour which has been driven off to the war. There is no bread because the railways are occupied for war purposes. Stop the war, and you will have bread." It was by speeches like this of Stalin's that the Kerensky Government was overthrown, and the Bolshevik régime took its place.

Where did you get it from, that in pre-Revolution days "we heard so much about Siberia, whereas in these days we hear very little about a Siberia which has become a much vaster and bleaker Hell"? Hell has many depths, but I have not yet heard of any deeper, vaster and bleaker than were those of Hitler Germany. As for Siberia, reports have come to me during the war about something very different from a hell growing up there. Big towns have been built, and the rich mineral resources have been exploited; shafts were sunk, coal and iron were mined; big metallurgical plants have been established, power-stations have arisen. Munition factories were organized, and tanks and guns and aeroplanes came from Siberia to help to smash the Nazi armies. There is a Jewish region in Siberia, called Biro-Bidjan, and the Jews there have worked and fought with the rest of the population of Siberia in the Patriotic War.

But that does not mean that Jews who are not Soviet subjects and who are not Communists have spent their time singing the praises of the Soviet Union and of Siberia. If you remember the chapter on Biro-Bidjan in my book, you will find that there was quite a lot of Jewish opposition to that project. And Zionists were and still are

sore about the refusal of the Soviet authorities to permit Zionist activity. I quote from a statement presented by the Zionist Labour Party in Soviet Russia to the Twentieth Zionist Congress held in August, 1937. "The continuous persecutions have well-nigh suppressed the various elements of the Zionist Federation and destroyed the foundation of its existence. The imprisonment of Zionists by the G.P.U. continues. Hundreds of loyal Zionists are in exile, in political-correctional prisons and in concentration camps. The suffering of our comrades is intensified by the economic distress and harsh climate of their places of confinement and banishment."

The common war against Hitler Germany brought many people nearer to Soviet Russia, who had till then stood suspiciously aloof. And there are Zionists among them. Dr. Levenberg, the Editor of the *Zionist Review*, has this reference to the matter: "The Soviet Government has shown to the world that its policy is not static. It may be hoped that the U.S.S.R. will be able to change those parts of its policy which have been unfavourable to Zionism."

Soviet spokesmen deny that Zionists are persecuted in Russia. "It is true", said one, "that Zionists were sent to prison, but not as Zionists. When the country was building, and every man was needed, could we have supported a movement which calls people to go out of their country, to Palestine? We wanted all the people in the Soviet Union to feel that they were part of the land, not strangers, not having to look for opportunities to go elsewhere. Jews have gone into the heavy industries, coal-mining, engineering, in the steel-works, in aviation plants. We have built up large Jewish agricultural regions. If any of our people had worked with their minds in another country it would have held up our constructive work, and if that had happened, would we have been as strong as we are, able to beat back the Nazis? The fate of the whole world de-

pended on it. We did not persecute Zionism. But it was not practical to develop such a movement in the Soviet Union.”

General Kisch records in the diary he kept in Palestine a visit from a Jewish journalist who had been stationed for some years in Moscow. “On the subject of the persecution of Zionists in Russia he told me that he had often discussed this matter with prominent Soviet personalities, who do not deny the persecution, which is undoubtedly a fact. At the same time they defend it on the grounds that the Zionists are definitely opposed to the Communist régime and that there is no reason why, because they happen to be Jews, they should be better treated than other Russian elements similarly opposed to the Soviets, which seems logical enough from the Soviet point of view.”

This is not the place to pursue the matter, but if you will read recent Jewish history, about the attitude of the Jewish organizations and spokesmen outside Russia to the Soviet régime from its beginning till the common war against Nazi Germany brought us all together, the feelings of religious Jews about the future of Jewish religion in the Soviet countries, and the feelings of Zionists about the position of Zionism in Russia, and about the activities of Jewish Communists in England and America and Palestine towards Jewish religious life and towards Zionist aspirations, you will see that your “two major Jewish aims—the establishment of the Soviet régime in Russia and the attainment of Zionism in Palestine”—did not by any means march together.

I have never heard of a madder idea than that Jews have deliberately planted Jewish representatives in all the different antagonistic parties and interests and movements throughout the world, as capitalists and Communists, as bankers and paupers, as atheists and religious revivalists,



in order to steer all these movements in the one direction of "Jewish world domination". Do not Jews differ among themselves in their opinions and attachments as other groups of people do? Surely the fact that there are human beings in every movement, however contradictory and conflicting, is evidence of a world-wide conspiracy by the human race to dominate the world. You might as well say that the Church of England has planted the Dean of Canterbury in the Communist Party, or that the Chesterton family has planted Mrs. Cecil Chesterton there, and so make out a case that the Church of England and the Chesterton family are both Communist, or that they are using the Communist Party to further their own domination plans. "You might just as well say. . . ." But that's the way the Mad Hatter went on.

What are you getting at with your insinuations about the Jews round Lloyd George, President Wilson, President Roosevelt, President Truman and Winston Churchill? Did they do the bidding of the Jews? Did Churchill do anything in his conduct of affairs that he was not himself convinced best served Britain? What is all this talk of his Jewish friends?

You speak of "the transference of financial power from this country to America: financial Jewry had shifted its H.Q. across the Atlantic," you say. Is the whole issue so simple? I have just read the *Sunday Times* Washington correspondent, Richard Strout, about President Truman's Lend-Lease problem, and it appears to be much more complicated. The motives were compounded of old-fashioned Isolationism, high tariff protectionism, and plain politics, the latter an attempt to discredit Mr. Truman with the American conservatives by identifying him with British Socialism. On the other side, Richard Strout finds "such a man as Henry Morgenthau, former Secretary for the Treasury" (an American Jew) "who

called for outright cancellation of the Lend-Lease accounts. Unfortunately, Mr. Morgenthau is out of office, and Mr. Roosevelt, under whom he served, is dead. Mr. Morgenthau's reason is, as an American "to establish goodwill". But some Americans may say, as they said of Roosevelt when they wanted to keep out of "Britain's war" into which he was leading them, that he is serving British interests, or the interests of "financial Jewry". *How are the Jews "plotting"?*

Mr. Amery, who hates the American loan, calls it "a lever to force us to adopt an economic policy of international trade which the Americans favour". Is American policy directed by Jews? "American money is, of course, a pervading political power," writes Mr. Hiram Motherwell, of the *Chicago Daily News*. And the people who dictated American policy in respect of Britain and of all Europe, "because American credit was indispensable to them", were, according to Mr. Motherwell, Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes, General Dawes, Mr. Charles Dewey, Mr. J. P. Morgan.

The fact is that as *The Times* points out, "a quarter of the national wealth of the United Kingdom was lost during the second world war. Assets abroad were realized, gold, dollar and other reserves were depleted and new overseas debts were accumulated." We are paying for fighting to save the world.

The British Empire has also undergone important changes, with the growth to strength and maturity of the Dominions. The Statute of Westminster, which you do not list among the crimes of "Jewish international money-power", was a "grand conception", Air Chief Marshal Sir Arthur Longmore (whom I have not yet heard described as a Jew) writes in *The Times*, "the policy of educating our Colonies up to a standard when they may achieve complete independence is a most laudable one, but please

do not let us deceive ourselves that the result leaves Britain just where she was as a great power in days gone by. As a united British Empire we should qualify in the highest category, but as an individual member of the British Commonwealth of Nations and with our population of less than fifty million, we most certainly do not, however brave, honest, enterprising or clever we may consider ourselves to be. Round the post-war conference tables our two big friends in west and east each speak for their nation with one voice, yet it seldom seems quite clear whether our representative speaks in the name of Britain or the Empire as a whole. Sometimes it even leads to recriminations among ourselves."

I think from the point of view of British interests, it is safer and healthier to face realities and try to deal with them realistically than to shut our eyes to them, and go about shouting "The Jews are destroying us".

Isaiah has something to say which might be considered both by "racial Jews" and the anti-semites who are obsessed by "Jewish blood": "For thus saith the Lord unto the eunuchs that keep my Sabbaths, and choose the things that please me, and take hold of my covenant. Even unto them will I give mine house and within my walls a place and a name better than of sons and daughters. Also the sons of the stranger, that join themselves to the Lord, to serve him and to love the name of the Lord, to be his servants, every one that keepeth the Sabbath." "He who publicly desecrates the Sabbath is on the same level as the idolater," declares Maimonides. "Without the Sabbath the whole structure of Jewry and Judaism must disintegrate," writes a Rabbi. You say something about Jews crowding into particular occupations. It is not because Jews will not do other things. It is because if they are to remain Jews, if they are to observe Judaism, they must work where they can keep the Sabbath and the other laws

of Judaism. "In London", said Zangwill in 1907, "the poor Jew is restricted by the Sabbath to a few sweated trades." Where the Jew has cast off the Sabbath and other restrictive Jewish observances, or where there are enough Jews employed to allow for the Jewish observances, Jews, as in the Soviet Union and in Palestine, engage in every kind of occupation, agriculture, house and machine building, transport, coal and iron mining.

The growing movement for a five-day week in industry may help the process, and of course the lost half day should be made up by extra hours during those five days.

I know the legend scrawled up with the Fascist flash on London walls before the war that no one ever saw a Jew with pick and shovel, meaning that Jews don't work themselves, only buy and sell and employ others to work for them. It is utterly untrue. You will perhaps say that tailoring and shoemaking in which great numbers of Jews are employed as workers are not really manual labour. But they need hard work. And they are very essential occupations. "For neither in tailoring nor in legislating does man proceed by mere accident," Carlyle has told us in *Sartor Resartus*. "Our world is ruled by clothes," said Dennis Bradley, the tailor-author. Our clothing coupons have thrust home the lesson. There is too a place like Salonica, where before the war nearly half the population was Jewish and the greater part of the Jewish population were dockers. In old Russia under the Czar, most of the Jews were artisans. I see that the Polish representative on the Unrra Council has been saying at the London meeting of the Council: "The ranks of our craftsmen sustained heavy losses owing to the extermination of the Jewish population, which owned about half of our handicrafts workshops." In Czarist Russia there were already about a quarter of a million Jewish agricultural workers, and the number has been largely increased under the Soviet régime.

There is a special organization, the ORT, which was formed over half a century ago and does this very thing, putting Jews into industry and agriculture, training them for manual labour. In Poland to-day, out of the hundred thousand Jews living there, thirty-nine out of every 100 are working in the coal mines, and many are in the factories.

In the United States there are to-day over 100,000 Jewish farmers. Jews were in Russia and Poland for decades engaged as textile workers, weavers by hand-loom and in the mills. They were also builders and carpenters and metal workers. It is not something new, this movement of Jews in Palestine and in the Soviet Union to hard manual labour.

But if Jews are to remain Jews there must be conditions which will enable them to keep the observances of Judaism. And one of the most important of these is the Sabbath. It only shows how little understanding some present-day Jews have of what it means to be a Jew that they can say in the same breath: "I am a Jew", and "I do not keep the Sabbath".

Achad Ha'am, the Zionist philosopher, has a biting passage in one of his essays about this kind of Jew, to whom the Sabbath means nothing more than "a heavy loss to businessmen and does not allow poor men to obtain work in factories". It is not a small matter. It is a gulf between the Jew who is a Jew and the "Jew" who is merely a "non-Aryan", or a non-Christian. It explains why Professor Harold Laski was not so warmly received when he announced at a Zionist meeting that he "felt like the prodigal son returning home" (even his image had to come from the New Testament) and went on to qualify his return by explaining that "he had no more interest in the Jewish religion than in any other creed", and that "as a Marxian Socialist he held that religion was opium for the

people". It is not so long ago since he declared "I never concern myself with Jewish matters". When Zangwill spoke of "Jews mighty in wealth and name and power", he did so to tell us that "we enjoy only the envy it arouses. This Jewish power has destroyed us time and again." "I have had from John Morley and Joseph Chamberlain the sympathy I could not obtain from Solomon Jacobs, M.P.", Zangwill declared.

What will you say to this passage from Bernard Shaw's *Early History of the Fabian Society*? "We urged our members to join the Liberal and Radical Associations of their districts, or if they preferred it, the Conservative Associations. On these bodies we made speeches and moved resolutions or better still, got the Parliamentary candidate for the constituency to move them. We permeated the party organizations and pulled all the wires we could lay our hands on with the utmost adroitness and energy; and we succeeded so far that in 1889 we gained the solid advantage of a Progressive majority, full of ideas that would never have come into their heads had not the Fabians put them there, on the first London County Council."

Of course L. Fry has his answer, in *Waters Flowing Eastward*—all the Fabians are Jews and it is another Jewish plot. "The close observer will discover, slavishly serving the Jewish cause under the mask of benevolence, democracy or liberalism, bishops, archbishops, prime ministers and national presidents, government officials of every rank and leading representatives of all other professions. He will recognize them at once as traitors who have sold themselves and their country for their own personal advantage." Everybody, in fact, except L. Fry and Arnold Leese ("No connection with Sir Oswald Mosley's pro-Jewish Organization"). I can just see Bernard Shaw and the Webbs and H. G. Wells and all the other founders and

organizers of the Fabian Society being duped by the Jews.

Do you think Colonel Gluckstein, who is both a Conservative and an anti-Zionist, rejoiced over the return to Parliament of a Labour man and Zionist like Barnett Janner, and his own defeat in the election, or that many Jews (some of them very important leaders of the Anglo-Jewish community) were not as much dismayed as any other Conservatives or National Liberals at the Labour landslide and Mr. Churchill's ejection from office? Was that too a Jewish plot? Or was it a natural revolt in the country and in the army against the grim and hard war determination of which people had grown weary with the end of the fighting in Europe, the desire of the soldiers to get back to civilian life and of the rest of the people to civilian ease, houses, jobs, more food and better living conditions, which the Labour Party promised them. I confess it was like a physical blow to me when Churchill was defeated. But Harold Laski and the twenty odd Jews elected as Labour M.P.'s notwithstanding, it is the feeling of the country that was expressed, and the Jews returned in the Labour interest are a reflection of the situation in the country as a whole, as much as the return of the other Labour M.P.'s, Catholics or Protestants or women, who all, like the Jews, had candidates of their own section of the community also in the opposing parties, only in the landslide they were overwhelmed.

"It would be erroneous", the *Jewish Chronicle* wrote in its editorial, "to deduce that the proportion of Jewish Labour M.P.'s represents the proportion of Jewish support for Labour in this country. It would be still more erroneous to imagine that Jews as a community have consciously attached themselves as a body to the Labour Party and that there is anything in the nature of a Jewish vote. The predominance of Labour followers among the

Jews in the new House reflects very accurately the sweeping triumph of the Left in the elections." The *Jewish Standard* had a note headed "No Mourning", in which it said: "Among those not returned one is gratified to find Mr. Hore-Belisha and Colonel Gluckstein. Colonel Gluckstein's presence in the House was always a menace to political Zionism. Mr. Hore-Belisha maintained a studied neutrality at a time when his help would have been of great service."

You are quite wrong, Chesterton, about the supposed interlinking of "Jewish interests". Except in the way any other group happens to have certain interests in common, which when these interests are involved, over-ride their other disagreements. The Catholic *Universe* reports, just as the *Jewish Chronicle* does of the Jewish M.P.'s that "fifteen of the thirty-seven Catholic candidates in the General Election will sit in the new House of Commons. In the last Parliament Catholics numbered twenty-one. Five Catholics, all Conservatives, lost their seats." The *Catholic Herald* similarly writes of "the Catholic representation in the new House of Commons". Ten of the Catholic M.P.'s are Labour men. I think the Baptists and the Methodists keep a similar record. There was a time when there was a Free Church vote in this country. "At the last election", Dr. Clifford said in 1909, "we had 200 Free Churchmen in the House of Commons." The new women M.P.'s held a special public meeting to celebrate their return as women M.P.'s, and all the parties were represented. I see also that the *Universe* follows with close interest the activities of the Catholic politicians in Spain and Belgium and even of the resuscitated Catholic Party in Germany, and that Catholic sympathy here for Poland is largely based on the fact that Poland is a Catholic country. I commend to your notice in this connection Lord Goddard's finding in the case of the alleged secret



court at Longton, at which a Roman Catholic priest was bound over for twelve months for assaulting a thirteen year-old boy: "That Mr. Hawley, Mr. Tams, Superintendent Edge and the Rev. Mr. Walsh all profess the Roman Catholic faith must inevitably give rise to the impression that there was here a conspiracy to prevent publicity regarding a charge of indecency against a priest of that Church."

You want me to tell you whether "that famous Coningsby passage" is merely a piece of imaginative writing. Well, I ask you. Read it, and see what you make of it. Zangwill has something very much to the point to say about Disraeli's "false romantic, his rococo personages, monotonously magnificent, his pseudo-Jewish stories, and his braggart assertions of blood". "The first Jesuits were Jews." Were they? Napoleon's Marshals, Soult and Massena, were Jews. On what evidence? The Russian Minister Count Caucrim, was a Jew. So was Count Armin in Germany, so was the Russian Minister of Finance, so was the Spanish Minister, "a Jew of Aragon". It is as little borne out by the facts as his other assertion in that "famous Coningsby passage" that "almost every great composer springs from our tribe", which he supports with the names only of Rossini (who was not a Jew nor of Jewish descent) Meyerbeer and Mendelssohn. Who will accept that? And note that when Disraeli "reflects with satisfaction", as you say, that "the world is ruled by very different personages to what is imagined by those who are not behind the scenes", he does not mean that they rule from behind the scenes, but that not everyone knows what he is revealing, that all these powerful personages are "like myself", the sons of Jews. It was his "false romantic" and "his braggart assertion of blood, played off against the insulting pride of the proudest aristocracy in the world". It is as much fictional as when in one of his own stories

Disraeli tells us of his entering a Catholic church, and "a Lutheran, for a moment I trembled". And ponder too what else he says in that "famous Coningsby passage", about the Jews being "essentially monarchical, deeply religious, shrinking from converts, ever anxious to see the religious systems of the countries in which they live flourish: the Jews are essentially Tories." Just like himself.

This tendency to attribute everything you don't like to some secret malign influence working against you led Shakespeare long ago to protest: "The fault is not in our stars, but in ourselves." Yet people still resort to the astrologers, and they still talk about the "hidden hand" of the Pope or of the Freemasons, or of Bolshevik gold, or of the Cliveden set, or of the Jews. Jews do it themselves. "Many people cannot understand the 'putsch' which was carried through by a 'hidden hand' at the general meeting of the Federation of Synagogues, when the most active workers suffered defeat," writes a correspondent in a South African Jewish weekly.

You ask me about the background of the Balfour Declaration in regard to Palestine. It so happens that it was Mr. Lloyd George who put about the "charming story" that "I felt a deep debt of gratitude, and so did all the Allies, to the brilliant scientific genius of Dr. Weizmann and when we asked him, 'What can we do for you in the way of any honour?' he replied: 'All I care for is an opportunity to do something for my people.' It was worth anything to us in honour, or in coin of the realm, but all he asked for was to be allowed to present his case for the restoration of his people to the old country which they had made famous throughout the world. Acetone converted me to Zionism. So the case was put before us, and when the War Cabinet began to consider the case for the Declaration, it was quite unanimously in favour. I think

we secured the co-operation of the French at that time, and the famous Balfour Declaration was made."

But the "charming story" is a little too charming to convince. Lord Samuel, who became the first High Commissioner for Palestine, writes in his Memoirs, "It is dramatic but incorrect and unfortunate to represent so great an event as the Balfour Declaration as though it were given instead of a Knighthood or a decoration, to a Jewish inventor for a timely discovery in the production of explosives."

Feeling in America had been growing for many reasons in favour of America's entry into the war. There was still much opposition to such a course. Both views were represented among all the racial and other groups in the United States, though I suppose the Irish were almost unanimous in their anti-British sentiment. So probably were the German-Americans. The American Jews were divided. Judge Brandeis, the American Zionist leader, had long "unhesitatingly banked on Allied victory. But thousands of Jews rightly felt that every Russian victory in Eastern Europe was a gain for the forces of oppression. Moreover there were Zionists who were pacifists. This mixed situation created an excellent opportunity for German propaganda in America. The Brandeis policy was to keep all pro-Germans and all German propaganda at arms' length. The Zionist Organization had no secrets to hide, but to keep it clear of German influence, disguised in the most benevolent and insidious forms of intrigue was no light task. It was however accomplished. From the beginning of 1917 Brandeis foresaw the entrance of the United States in the war. In May, 1917, on the arrival of the Balfour Mission to the United States, Mr. Balfour singled out Brandeis at his first official reception as one with whom he desired private conversation."

This, from the biography of Judge Brandeis by Jacob de

Haas, is the background of "Zionist influence" in America's entry into the war. The Palestine Royal Commission of 1937 reminded us that "at the time of the Balfour Declaration the German Government was doing all it could to win the Zionist Movement over to its side: and after the Declaration it hastened, in conjunction with its Turkish allies, to formulate a rival proposition. The Balfour Declaration was not an expression of wholly new sympathies," it explained. "But the time and manner in which these sympathies were translated into action were determined by the exigencies of the war." The Report quoted Mr. Lloyd George, who was Prime Minister at the time, outlining "in the evidence he gave before us, the serious position in which the Allied and Associated Powers then were", and the belief that "Jewish sympathy would confirm the support of American Jewry and would make it more difficult for Germany to reduce her military commitments."

But not all Jews were Zionists then or are Zionists now. The strongest opposition in the Government to the Balfour Declaration came from a Jew, Mr. Edwin Montagu, the Secretary of State for India. "Balfour's support for the policy of giving a pledge to the Zionists", writes Lord Balfour's niece and biographer, Mrs. Dugdale, "was the deciding factor against the opposition of Mr. Montagu, whose definite hostility put a formidable weapon into the hands of those Ministers who were against British commitments in the Middle East." There was also opposition from the official leaders of the Anglo-Jewish community, Mr. D. L. Alexander, K.C., the President of the Board of Deputies of British Jews and Dr. Claude G. Montefiore, the President of the Anglo-Jewish Association, who published an anti-Zionist manifesto in *The Times*, in May, 1917.

In addition to rousing Zionist hopes with regard to

Palestine which, as you say, led Balfour, as Foreign Minister, to believe that a declaration in favour of Zionist aspirations would strengthen Britain in American public opinion, Turkey's intervention in the war on the side of Germany also brought up the question of British security in Egypt, the protection of the Suez Canal and of the route to Bagdad and to India. There was a division in the Cabinet between the adherents of the Eastern and Western schools of strategy. Lloyd George and Churchill, with his Gallipoli expedition, belonged to the Eastern school. "The Gallipoli expedition, had it managed to strain across the few yards that at one time separated it from decisive victory, might well have ended the war in 1916, if it had the result of concentrating the main offensive effort of the Allies on the weak Austrian front," Herbert Sidebotham has written. "The Suez Canal is the main artery of our communication with India and the East," he proceeds, and he quotes an editorial in the *Manchester Guardian* in November, 1915, which said: "Egypt is the weakest spot in our system of Imperial defence. We were a sea-Empire, incapable of being attacked by land except at this one strategic point, Egypt. The fact was disguised from us by our habit of regarding Turkey as a friendly country. If we were at such great trouble in the past to defend the integrity of Turkey against Russia, regarding it as the condition of our safety in India, obviously we cannot afford to be indifferent in the future now that this war has shown us what is possible under an alliance between Turkey and Germany." That is why Sidebotham and others, including the Prime Minister and the Foreign Secretary, supported the idea of establishing the Jews in Palestine as "a protective bastion".

General Sir R. Gordon-Finlayson writing about the problems before the peacemakers, speaks of the Middle

East, emphasizing the importance of the immense oil deposits there, and drawing attention to the fact that "the Suez Canal represents almost the hub of the trading universe, and that it becomes entirely Egypt's property in some ten years' time". The port of Haifa, the Mosul oil pipe line which flows to Haifa, and the air bases at Haifa, Gaza and Lydda are very important British interests in Palestine. Lieut.-General Sir G. Le Q. Martel has written a foreword to a pamphlet called *Defence of the Middle East*, in which he writes: "Within the framework of our Empire there are certain nodal points. One of these is the Middle East. In considering the future defence of this area it is well to bear in mind that in Palestine there exists the largest homogenous European community outside Europe in the old world. This community is becoming increasingly industrialized and might easily be made capable of producing a large proportion of the military equipment needed for its part in the defence of the Middle East."

You say you "know of no British Zionist who cares a straw about this vital British interest" ("the sense of obligation towards the Arabs and an awareness of the crucial importance of British relations with the Moslem world") "or who would not willingly kick it aside in order to attain the fulfilment of his dream". I am not a Zionist, but I have a fair knowledge of what British Zionists think and say, and they are not so indifferent to British interests. There was one British Zionist, for instance, who was the official head at the time of the Zionist Organization in Palestine, who wrote in regard to certain complaints made against the British Mandatory authorities that it was not sufficiently promoting Zionist settlement in Palestine: "A great nation will not allow itself to be accused of betraying an obligation, even when the accuser is another nation of equal might, and this is the more true when hostility is incurred from other quarters precisely on

the grounds that the obligation at issue is being discharged. Nor can we reasonably expect the Mandatory to treat Palestine as if it were an isolated territory in which only Jewish rights and interests were involved. We must seek to secure more adequate support without making England's task in Palestine too difficult and ungrateful."

That British Zionist was the Brigadier-General Kisch whom you deny the name of Englishman, conceding only that he "performed for the country of his adoption most gallant and distinguished service". Montgomery, under whom Kisch served, made no such question about his position as a British soldier. And his men did not ask if he was pure "Anglo-Saxon" before they followed him, till he went to his death. He was a man born in this country, of British-born parents, brought up here, sworn to loyalty to its Crown and people, and knowing no divided loyalty. But I suppose you would equally deny the term Australian to General Monash, in spite of his Anzacs. There was once a young English Jew, Lieut. Frank de Pass, who was killed in action in the first war, the first Jew to be awarded the V.C. The citation awarding him the posthumous honour says: "He was the perfect type of British officer. He was the idol of his men." You would refuse his memory that title, "British officer". But you were ready to accept William Joyce, who tried to wriggle out of his allegiance to Britain, by claiming that he was born in New York. Surely he knew that, when he was mouthing his "British patriotic" stuff for the British Union of Fascists, and telling people like Kisch, that they were not British. I see that John Amery also claimed that he had become a subject of Spain, and was therefore not liable to English treason laws. When I sit in Synagogue and see among the prayer-shawled worshippers straight tall lads, wearing the King's uniform, soldiers and sailors and airmen, with service stripes and wound stripes, and some in

hospital blue, most of whom had I met them in the street outside I would never have known them for any different from their fellows who are not Jews, I wonder by what right you tell them that they are less the King's true subjects than you are yourself. Podsnappery, Robert Ross calls that kind of attitude to a man's Englishry. "When the inhabitants of the uncultured portion of these islands employ the adjective un-English", he writes, "in nine cases out of ten it is aimed at some characteristic essentially, often blatantly, Anglo-Saxon." Dickens warned us that "Mr. Podsnap's world was not a very large world, morally; no, nor even geographically: seeing that although his business was sustained upon commerce with other countries, he considered other countries a mistake, and of their manners and customs would conclusively observe, 'Not English!' when Presto! with a flourish of the arm and a flush of the face they were swept away."

While we are on this point of nationalism, does not the French Jew Mandel stand out in all the sorry business of Petain and Vichy France as a shining light of French patriotism? Whose was the dual loyalty—the Jew Mandel's, or the pro-German Laval's, in his thousands? On that point of dual loyalty, I have been reading a speech delivered by the President of the American-Polish Associations, Mr. Kaszubowski: "There was never any conflict between our love for the land of our forefathers and our love for America, the land of our and our children's future." If you object that the Poles are a nation and that I claim the Jews are a religious community, I would say that differences are differences, whatever their cause. A man may differ from the majority of his fellow citizens because he came originally from another country and had a different early upbringing, or he may differ from them because he observes a different religion which imposes on him to some extent a different way of life. I have



just read a little book on Yugoslavia, which begins with this sentence: "In a country slightly larger than England there lived about ten million Serbs, Croats, Slovenes, Macedonians, Montenegrins, Moslems." You see how the racial and religious groups are equally separated.

The sense of loyalty to the place where you live and the people among whom you live and where you have all your interests and associations is a very real thing, which except with a few cranks and misfits, or when an "anti-alien" movement tends to spread a feeling that they are unwanted and things are made so unpleasant for them that any self-respecting man must long for more congenial surroundings, overrides "racial" and other affiliations and weakens and ultimately destroys all but certain romantic associations with the "old home". With Jews the bond with other Jews remains religious and philanthropic, and as long as there is anti-semitism also protective against the common enemy. If Jews have a special regard for Palestine it is essentially because of its associations with the Bible, as the home of the Patriarchs and the Prophets. And that special regard for Palestine Christians have too. But under normal conditions normal people feel only one real loyalty, that which belongs to the land in which they have their home and their future. I have seen even Japanese wearing American uniform, enlisted to fight Japan, because their only home and their only interests are American. The soil tugs at you, and a man like a tree becomes rooted.

It brings me back to the position of Zionists. Here is a statement signed by a number of leading American Zionists, and it makes clear their attitude towards their country: "We completely repudiate any suggestion of a common political unity among the Jews of the world, or any political tie with the people or Government of Palestine now or hereafter. We in America have only one

—and that is an exclusive—political loyalty; that loyalty is to the United States.” Rabbi Dr. Stephen Wise, who was one of the signatories to that statement, has since repeated it: “We Jews are Americans, Americans first, last and all the time.”

The position of the British Zionists is no different. One of them, Israel Cohen, has put it in this way: “A Zionist owes allegiance only to the State of which he is a citizen, and to no other State or State authority. His devotion to the Zionist cause does not entail political allegiance to the mandated territory of Palestine, which in any case is not an independent State. If and when a Jewish State is established it will claim the loyalty or political allegiance only of those who are its citizens. Zionists outside Palestine will naturally continue to be concerned in the welfare of the Jewish State and to contribute to its progress, but they will not be called upon to declare or show any political allegiance towards it.”

When I hear a German or a Polish Jew who was deprived of his nationality and all he possessed, had all his family and friends murdered in death camps, and has emerged a solitary destitute survivor speak desperately about fighting his way into Palestine, because he cannot stay where he is, and this Mad Hatter world insists on shouting “no room” at the tea table, this is the wild way any uprooted person talks, who feels he has nothing to lose, whatever he does in the attempt to save himself. And I assure you that his wrath will be poured out against me or against Israel Cohen or Rabbi Stephen Wise much more than against you, if we remonstrate with him, and remind him that we Jews in England or America are not homeless and dispossessed, that we have loyalties to our country, and that his declaring war against the world and dying like Samson under the ruins is not going to do us any good, and that our lives and future are not less im-

portant than those of himself and his fellows. He will accuse us of being selfish and sacrificing him to save our own skins. It is the outlaw's attitude to those who sit safely at home, of all outlaws to all who have homes and are secure. God save us from their plight, for I doubt if we were similarly placed whether we, you and I, would speak differently. Remember the sans-cullottes. "Aux lanternes!" was their cry, whether it was an aristocrat they met or just an ordinary citizen like ourselves.

J.L.

## The Wrong Shape

MY DEAR CHESTERTON,

I want to come back to your point about British Zionists not caring a straw about vital British interests or about the Arabs. In the first place, I can't see much difference between what Zionists are saying about the Palestine Mufti and his friends in Palestine, and what W. A. Hirst wrote in *Truth* that "many of the people with whom we are negotiating (in India) are the King's enemies. Some have carried on treasonable correspondence with Japan. Mr. Gabhas Bose, once a prominent Congress leader, spent years in Berlin. The Congress leaders are tainted with disloyalty."

Let me again quote General Kisch, from his book *Palestine Diary*: "The discussion of specific British interests in Palestine does not fall within the scope of this book, but the Jews recognize that full safeguards for those interests must form part of any settlement of the Palestine question. It may be recalled that Theodor Herzl, the founder of organized Zionism, already in 1897 directed the movement towards an English loyalty. From that loyalty the growing Jewish structure in Palestine has never wavered. During the international crisis of 1935-36 Jewish leaders in Palestine were discussing how many men could be offered to England for the defence of Palestine, a maximum figure in relation to the population being seriously entertained. It is not unreasonable to suppose that at the same time the Mufti and his associates were discussing their plans for the rebellion which was soon to break out. Most of the features which constitute British interests lie within the natural zone of the Jewish State, and it is certain that the Jews will be ready to accord all necessary provisions to guarantee those interests."

It would be silly to suggest that all Zionists everywhere are thinking all the time only of British interests. They are concerned with their position as Jews. Zionism aims at creating a Jewish homeland where Jews will be able to live a normal life as Jews. And Jews outside the British Empire owe no allegiance to Britain. But with Palestine part of the British Imperial system, Jews thinking of going to Palestine had also to think of themselves as becoming ultimately associated with British interests. Much of the difficulty in the way of contact between the Jews of the Soviet Union and the Jews outside was due to the general Soviet distrust of the outside world, but in the matter of Zionism it was quite definitely associated with the feeling that Zionists were in some way through their interest in Palestine connected with British Imperial policy. The Soviet Press spoke of the Russian Zionists as "British agents". I remember reading in a Soviet paper a circumstantial story about British Imperial interests requiring the Mosul oil supplies, which had to be brought by pipe line to Haifa, and that this made it necessary for Britain to possess Palestine. To give British annexation a Mandatory justification the Jews had been brought into the picture with the promise of a Jewish National Home, but Sir Herbert Samuel (now Lord Samuel) the Jew who had been sent to Palestine to govern there for Britain, was a British oil magnate. It so happens that the Samuels who are oil magnates are Lord Bearsted's family, and unrelated to Lord Samuel's family, but you see how the story can be made to look from another point of view.

It is natural that Zionists who are also British subjects should approach their Zionist problem from an angle largely qualified by their citizenship, upbringing, background and allegiance. Some of Philip Guedalla's speeches delivered at Zionist Congresses will illustrate this point. I think that all speeches by British Zionists at the Con-

gresses will. Horace Samuel, who "entered the country as a Zionist in the year 1918 in the ranks of Colonel Paterson's Jewish Regiment", writes, "One may be permitted to doubt whether the British Government would ever seriously have concerned itself with Palestine but for the facts that its geographical position affords a strategic base other than Egypt for the control of the Suez Canal, and a stepping place in the airway to India." I wonder if Zangwill was not right when he suggested that "much of the present Zionism in Anglo-Jewry has its origin in their British patriotism and their patriotic fervour for the extension of the British Empire in the East". Even anti-Zionists often hesitate to attack Zionism, because of the British interests involved. "That I am a non- or even an anti-Zionist is well-known, and I make no secret of it," Dr. Claude Montefiore declared. "But I never write about it at length, and indeed I conceive it to be my duty not to do so. My main reason is that I am an Englishman. Now England is the Mandatory Power for Palestine, and it is not fitting for an Englishman to write at length against the heavy task which England has chosen to accept and seeks to accomplish."

"It is imperative", writes the *Jewish Chronicle* in an editorial "to maintain a clear understanding of the real issues of policy with which Britain is confronted. Obviously the interests of this country in the wider as well as the narrower view are the paramount consideration in the Government's responsibility and will—or should be—the determining factor in their decisions."

Mr. Shinwell is not, as far as I know, a Zionist, and I am not sure about how far he is positively a Jew. But he is regarded as one, and on this point of not caring a straw about British interests in the East and in India, you may like to know what he says about it: "Zionists should keep their sense of proportion and perspective and realize that

Palestine is merely one fragment of a vast Imperial problem. They and Jews in general should never forget how relatively small the Jewish question is among the world's great problems, which will have to be solved after the war. Britain has absolutely no interest in the Jews qua Jews or in the future of Jewry. In most respects British Governments merely regard Jews as a tedious and troublesome problem with which they don't want to be concerned." Not very much blinded by "Jewish egotism", is he?

I don't see why Jews, being a minority, with the grim toll of anti-Jewish persecution and extermination so blindingly before them, should not turn their hopes on the possibility of a land of refuge in Palestine, where they might be able to live at peace. It is natural that being full of their own troubles they should not always stop to consider the difficulties which the solution of their problem might cause to others. It is a very human trait, common to all. You and I are probably no less prone to it than other people. But I know that the Jewish question and Palestine cannot be dealt with in a vacuum. Twenty years ago I was writing in a Jewish paper that the brave little craft of Zionism was afloat on a sea full of many other vessels, some of them big ocean liners, and that it cannot just keep its own course without running the risk of collision. I can imagine nothing more likely to create resentment than Zionist insistence on bringing the Palestine issue into the forefront of international affairs at a time when the whole future of the world is being replanned. It must harm Jews and Palestine equally, because they do not live outside the world economy, and are bound to suffer like all others from any world maladjustment.

I am saying this out of a sense of reality, and not because I am a timorous Jew, trying to efface himself and his problem, and be subservient and servile. Maximilian Harden in the days of the Russian pogroms thirty years ago said

that he could understand the Russian peasants organizing pogroms and killing Jews, when they found them taking insults and blows without standing up for themselves and hitting back. It was not true, as it happens, for the Jews of Russia did hit back. There were Jewish self-defence groups, which engaged in fierce battles with the pogromists. But it is a different thing to go about flaunting your troubles in the face of a world that is full of its own troubles, and doesn't quite know how to deal with them. The Jewish question cannot be considered by an irascible world, trying to tackle the big problems arising out of the war. And a self-righteous gadfly buzzing around all the time is not going to sting the world into sweet reasonableness.

I am grimly amused when I read the different reports and articles in the Jewish papers about anti-semitism in England or America or Australia or wherever it may be, and then opposing to this unpleasantness an idyllic picture of Jewish peace and contentment in a Jewish Palestine. Faced with "the external menace of anti-semitism and the internal menace of de-Judaisation", there "arose", as Zangwill put it, "the vision of this new land of Israel, like the sight of domes and cupolas to the thirsting traveller in the desert". People "drew a picture of the Jewish State and putting beside it a picture of the Diaspora cried, like Hamlet, 'Look here upon this picture and on this.' And assuredly the counterfeit presentments of Hamlet's father and of his uncle exhibited no greater contrast—the one 'wholesome', the other, 'like a mildew'd ear'. It is in a sense almost a mockery of the Jewish misery to hold up before it such a picture of success and happiness."

I have also read Zionist articles about the Jewish frustration in Palestine, the difficulties and the restrictions, the hostilities and the squabbles among Jews themselves, and the whole miserable story which seems to be



repeating itself in the land of dreams. It appears that there are no utopias, and that if you remove one set of difficulties you get them replaced by others. No body of human beings and no human enterprise is free from difficulties and troubles. We have never wanted for Jews either a featherbed or a fire-proof existence. And it is only utopists and visionaries who think such things can be. The Jew who believes that he can continue to be a Jew, even in a Jewish land, in a non-Jewish world, without suffering the inconveniences resulting from it, which some Jews declare they would not be without, because it gives them the privilege of testifying to God, as the early Christians sought martyrdom, is as much a utopist as the anti-semite who thinks that with only the "Jew-parasite" removed this world will be a paradise.

But I must get back to your point, which seems to be that all Jews, or all Zionists are in a conspiracy to denounce Britain and the British officials in Palestine, without any regard for anything except Jewish demands. You refer for instance to Sir Ronald Storrs having said something about attacks being made on him and the British officer class in American newspapers because he found it impossible to grant certain Jewish demands.

But Sir Ronald says that this happened equally to British officers in Palestine who were Jews. "Albert Hyamson had been a British Civil Servant, and now found himself head of the Palestine Immigration Department, applying the necessary but complicated regulations for the admission of Jews under the Mandate. These regulations (like those of the Customs for most people) it was for many a point of honour as well as a pleasure to defeat. Hyamson accepted or rejected applications with the conscientiousness traditional in the British Civil Service, and in consequence soon became one of the most unpopular figures in Pan-Zionism."

There is too Professor Norman Bentwich, who was Attorney-General in Palestine, of whom Dr. Norman Maclean has written: "Professor Bentwich never seems able to forget that he has been a British official." The sentence occurs in Dr. Maclean's review of Bentwich's book *Judea Lives Again*, which has a foreword by the same Sir Ronald Storrs, and which Dr. Maclean finds far too detached for a Jew at a time of anti-semitic atrocities. You can see how Bentwich feels about British interests and about the Arabs by this passage from another of his books: "Sir Ronald Storrs has suggested that the National Home would be 'a little loyal Jewish Ulster in a sea of potentially hostile Arabism'. The parallel is not auspicious; and before it becomes closer, the most determined attempt should be made to avoid crystallizing the hostility of the Arab people. Palestine, whether in peace or in war, must retain, in any future that can be foreseen, a special relation with the British Commonwealth."

Tell me, did you really mean that when Sir Ronald Storrs spoke of cartoons being published in the United States "holding up to ridicule the British official class", it justified you in suggesting that this was an explanation of "the more recent anti-British propaganda on the other side of the Atlantic", "manoeuvres understandable from the Jewish point of view"?

An American from Texas tells us in a letter to the *Manchester Guardian* that "this state of affairs has been arrived at without the broadsides of American Zionism, which seem to be presented to the people in Britain by the Labour Government as an explanation of the feeling of the American people. During a recent journey through thirty-two States the writer has not once seen any clear evidence of the existence of American Zionists."

"Even anti-semites are stilled when the Zionist case is stated in anti-British terms", *The Times* Washington cor-

respondent says. "There are Americans, and a good many of them, in whom anti-Britishism works like a tic douloureux. It is always easier, and it is in fact, traditional, to attach the greater part of the blame to Britain."

When people like Edgar Mowrer and Quentin Reynolds write about "British brutality and trickery in Palestine" are they merely repeating what American Jews tell them to say? Or when the *Boston Post* explains to its readers that "British policy in Palestine is cut from the same cloth as the old British policy on Irish home rule and the old Imperial policy in India"?

Do you remember "Big Bill Thompson", the anti-British Mayor of Chicago, the Hearst Press, and the McCormick papers, and the anti-British Isolationists in America, who tried to keep America out of the war which would probably have meant British defeat? When *The Times* reported the death of Senator Hiram W. Johnson, it said that his "attitude was generally coloured by an intense suspicion of Great Britain". And it is Senator Burton K. Wheeler, who is described in the London Press as "the most consistent Britain-hater".

I am afraid that a lot of anti-British feeling among American Zionists is being implanted in them for their own ends by people who are not thinking of helping Zionism or Jews, but of causing trouble to Britain. "Most of it is inherited," Scrutator writes in the *Sunday Times*, of this "anti-British sentiment in the United States", "from Irish or German parents; or it even descends (kept alive by school text books) right down from the War of Independence." Professor Brogan, in the *Observer*, adds "Hundreds of thousands of voters of Italian origin, who are bitter over Trieste."

You know the anti-British feeling of the Irish-Americans. There is a Christian clergyman in America, the Rev. John Haynes Holmes, who is a friend of the Jews and very

sympathetic to Zionism, and he finds it difficult to understand how the Jews could have trusted the British. Of course, he is thinking not of the British Jews, but of the American Jews. "The central fact about the Balfour Declaration", he writes, "is that it was a war measure, issued not to help the Jews to Zion, but the English and their Allies to victory. England had to defeat the Turk, secure complete control of the Near East, and thus swing every influence in that region to her side. England was thinking primarily of herself and her military needs. The very name Balfour should have been enough to stir doubts and conjure fears within the Jewish heart. He would harry the Jews of Palestine to-day as ruthlessly as he harried the patriots of Ireland yesterday, if they disturbed the interests or threatened the peace of British rule. Nothing of all I saw in Zion so disturbed me, so disquieted me, as the elevation of 'Bloody Balfour' as one of the patron-saints of Zion."

Compare this with the utterances of a distinguished American Jew, Justice Felix Frankfurter, who wrote in 1931: "Great Britain's generous attitude towards Jews and the sway that the Old Testament, and thereby Palestine, exercised over British imagination, the link that Palestine serves between East and West, all combined to make Great Britain the special sponsor of Jewish hopes. It is sheer untruth to suggest that Great Britain espoused the Jewish cause to enlist Jewish finance on the Allied side. The rich and powerful Jews opposed Zionism." And this: "If the Jewish homeland cannot be built without making the Arabs' lot worse rather than better, it ought not to be built." "The two obligations Britain has undertaken—securing the establishment of a Jewish national home, and safeguarding the rights of the non-Jewish communities—will be revealed, not only as reconcilable, but in essence complementary. The fulfilment of

these international obligations will then rank among the fairest achievements of the British Crown, and the nations of the world will bless the name of Britain."

This was at the time of the Passfield White Paper, when Lloyd George, Winston Churchill, Lord Hailsham, Viscount Simon and other British statesmen were challenging the policy of the Labour Government of the time as contrary to the intention of the Palestine Mandate. Not all American Zionists are so restrained. Both then and now, in protest against the White Paper of 1939, some American Zionists have spoken out very strongly against the methods of the British Colonial Office and its officials in Palestine. But they are not British subjects. And as one of them says: "Since when can the British play censor of the utterances in the Congress of the United States? No official of the United States Government can censor what is said on the floor of the House, let alone a foreign official."

What does the *Jewish Chronicle*, being the paper of British Jews, say about these attacks on British policy? "It is a matter for regret", writes the *Jewish Chronicle*, "that Mr. Louis Lipsky (one of the American Zionist leaders) deemed it expedient almost to sidetrack the many and vital domestic Zionist problems, and instead to return to the hackneyed, well-trodden paths of assailing British Palestinian policy. An examination of those internal Zionist weaknesses which can hardly have escaped his own experience and observation would have been more relevant and more immediately useful than beating the old drum of the Mandatory's faults or defaults. He could have sought to explain, for instance, why Zionism in America has not received far wider and far more active support among the Jewish population of the United States than it has."

I am not now concerned with the views expressed, but with the diversity of Jewish and Zionist opinion on a

matter on which you assure me that all Jews speak with one voice. Incidentally, you will note the point about Zionism in America not having received wider and more active support among the Jewish population of America. I don't think there is a great deal of active opposition to Zionism, though that too exists, but there is real interest in it only among a section of the Jews of America. It so happens that the most important American newspaper in which a Jew has a say, the *New York Times*, is anti-Zionist; and whether the American Council for Judaism, headed by Lessing J. Rosenwald, who is, I believe, a millionaire, is a big body or a small (it claims a membership of 3,500) it is very active and fiercely anti-Zionist.

I am not sure of the exact position of some of the other Jewish organizations in America, but I see that an American Jewish observer reports to the Anglo-Jewish Association about "the Jewish Labour Committee, an organization of conservative Jewish Trade Unions, whose chief ideology is determined opposition to Soviet Russia on the one hand and to Zionism on the other."

You will find it impossible if you look at Jewish life with an honest desire to see what is actually going on there, to justify the assertion that all Jews and all Jewish organizations pursue a common agreed purpose. They do so no more than any other group of people who agree on a particular creed or outlook, but differ among themselves on everything else. Even the congregation of a parish church met for common worship consists of people who violently disagree on a score of vital issues; how much more so a worldwide community of millions of people, of every social class and political belief and national allegiance and upbringing. You might as well say that all Christians because they are Christians are united in a common world-wide policy seeking Christian domination. "Evidence" of the same kind that is produced against

the Jews could easily be provided. Take for instance a little book called *A Christian Basis for the Post-War World*. It has all the elements out of which a "Protocols of the Learned Elders of Christianity" could be constructed. The late Archbishop of Canterbury introduced the volume with a sentence which seems to me ordinary common sense: "There is always need of co-operation among all Christians in calling men to act in conformity with the principles which they profess." But if Jews say that about Jewish principles, they are at once "plotting against the world".

I spoke just now of the different classes and political beliefs and characters and interests found among the congregation of any small parish church, or among the congregation of any synagogue. I should here refer to the fact that though for obvious reasons their number is small, here and there a synagogue also contains one or two whose parents or one parent were not Jewish by "blood" or faith, yet who as conforming Jews are fully at home there. I know several myself, and there are more than most people suspect. Sir John de Villiers, who was one of them, has written: "Never did it occur to me that by embracing the faith of my father I might smooth the path I had to climb, and never did I doubt for a moment in later life that in heart and mind I was essentially a son of Israel." What is there in this to justify you saying that Jews will accept converts only on their terms? Which Church admits non-communicants? Does the Church of England? Was Sir John less English because he followed his mother's religion, not his father's?

Yet can you imagine what an outcry there would be if Jews carried on an active missionary work in this country, to win people for Judaism? Lord George Gordon who, after leading the Protestant "No Popery" riots which form the background to Dickens's *Barnaby Rudge*, became a Jew, was considered mad because of it. "The laws of

Christian emperors and other circumstances, including the rise and the growth of Islam, gradually but effectually closed the long era of Jewish missionary propaganda. Conversion to Judaism never entirely ceased, but the full power to seek to make converts was stopped, and with the power there ceased the desire." There is also the Rabbinic law, to which I have referred before, that proselytes may not be accepted to Judaism, whose sole or main motive is ulterior, marriage or any kind of gain. But the principle of proselytization remains. Judaism is not a tribal creed, but a divine religion, a way of belief and of life, open to all men. If Jews speak of "world dominion", it is in the sense of the whole world coming to know the One God, as we say in our prayers: "Let all the inhabitants of the world perceive and know that unto Thee every knee must bow, every tongue must swear." It is the ancient promise of the Prophet, "And the Lord shall be King over all the earth."

You speak, for example, of Zangwill "admitting" that the League of Nations was "typically Jewish in its inspiration", when obviously what he meant was its original apparent setting up of the Prophetic ideal of world-peace and justice between nations. But you give his words a mercenary sinister twist, as though what he meant by it was the "return to the gold standard" or something of that sort. To anyone who knew Zangwill the suggestion is absurd. I remember that Zangwill was soon shaken out of his prophetic dream. "It is not in fact a League of Nations that has come forth", he complained, "but a League of Damnations." It was a long time before others saw this as clearly as he did, and it became general to talk of "the failure of the League of Nations". It was a failure to Zangwill not because it had failed to serve "Jewish interests", but because it had failed to serve the interests of world peace.



The "neurosis of fear", whose cure you say "must be a Jewish responsibility", is not caused by Jews, but by those who treat Jews and other minorities in such a way that it creates a "neurosis of fear" in them. The responsibility for ceasing to whip people is that of the whipper. Jews are not the only sufferers. "The operation of the psychology of fear which is amply illustrated by the case of the Jews is equally evident in the treatment of other minorities", the American Committee on the Rights of Religious Minorities, an overwhelmingly Christian body, stated in its report on conditions in Roumania before the war, speaking of the treatment of the Roumanian Baptists and Adventists. "Petty officials acting under Government orders devise their own means of persecuting the Baptists and these are often cruel."

You ask me whether I propose that "because criticism of the Jew has led to violence against the Jews, such criticism is socially or morally wrong". My dear Chesterton, do you remember writing to me: "The unutterable abominations of Buchenwald and elsewhere completely knocked me flat and filled me with such horror that I began to doubt whether human affairs are not too far gone in depravity for anybody to do anything about them." When I said that "anti-semitism drips with blood" I meant something much more inhuman, much more diabolic than "criticism of the Jew", or even "violence against the Jew". I have never asked that Jews should be immune from criticism, or that Jews who have offended against the laws should not be punished, like others. "I would not call it anti-semitism", I wrote when Hitler came to power in 1933, "if Germany suppressed all crooks, all degenerates, even all foes of the present régime, and all those among them who are Jews. I hate suppression, and I am not sure about the definitions, but it would not be applied to Jews as Jews." I have also said that

“Jews must not take up the attitude that because they are Jews and a much maligned minority they are entitled to rights and privileges not accorded to other members of their community.” But that does not mean that we must be silent about the sufferings of Jews, because they are Jews. “We are entitled to count our dead, and to listen to the tears of women and children, even if they are Jews,” Professor Brodetsky once said.

I have never suggested that Jews are the only people who have been or are persecuted and suffering. Even in Germany the Jews were not alone in their sufferings under Hitler. There were many others besides Jews in the concentration camps and in exile. Why do you speak as though only German Jews worked against Hitler? You will find that there were a great many non-Jewish Germans working and fighting against Hitler here and in America.

There were many more besides Jews who felt that the British bombers coming over Germany were bringing them release from the Nazi oppression. Even former Nazi supporters found their way to the concentration camps and the execution squads, and there would have been more if people like Rauschning and Otto Strasser had been caught. There is a story in the papers about a German Christian Pastor who went back to Germany from England to help in a plot to assassinate Hitler, and was caught and put into a concentration camp and murdered.

And when Lord Mountbatten praised the Germans who fought for Britain, and said it was to them they must look for the building of a new Germany, I am sure that most of them were not Jews.

*Per contra*, there were German Jews who, had the racial laws not kept them out, would have been loyal supporters of Hitler. I have a book by a German Jew,

Max Berges, who writes: "Jews as a group fall into no political classification. They wish to live, to obey the law, and to have as little to do with politics as any others. Ninety per cent. of the Jews of Germany would have been National Socialists had National Socialism not espoused anti-semitism. The petty bourgeoisie, Jewish and Gentile, are a large, complacent majority." During the 1914 war, Walther Rathenau supported the German slave-driving of the Belgians. "The truth is", the *Jewish Chronicle* writes in an editorial, "that Rathenau was soaked through and through with German culture", and quoting Santayana's definition of German culture and his contention that it has "its faithful flock in the disciplined mass of the nation; its heretics in the Socialists; its dupes in the Catholics and the Liberals", it comments, "and he might well have added 'the Jews'." Anatole France tells a story of a rich French Jew who informs the anti-semitic anti-Socialist candidate in an election: "I gave you my vote, because anti-semitism is humbug—but Socialism is a serious matter. Socialism is the danger. That is why I voted for you."

Edgar Mowrer brings the story up to date. In *Germany Puts the Clock Back*, he writes: "Many, including some Jews, contributed money to openly reactionary movements considered 'friendly to capital'."

You over-simplify the problem by trying to divide humanity into Jew and non-Jew. Both are subject to the same temptations and influences, and both groups contain all sorts of people, heroes and time-servers, sinners and saints. There is much more to the human problem than anti-semites want to see.

"At least no future Hitler will be able to say that Germany never lost the war, but was stabbed in the back by the Jews," writes Mr. Colin Coote in the *Daily Telegraph*.

Thomas Mann, who is, I suppose the greatest living

German (and he is not a Jew) was the chief anti-Nazi propagandist during the war. "I should have suffocated", he wrote, "had I not been able now and again to cleanse my heart, to give from time to time free vent to my abysmal disgust at what was happening at home. Justly or not, my name had become connected for the world with the conception of a Germany which it loved and honoured. The disquieting challenge rang in my ears, that I and no other must in clear terms contradict the ugly falsification which this conception of Germany was now suffering."

Do you know how many Americans of German birth and descent fought against Germany? To the Nazis, Eisenhower himself was a "blood German", fighting against his "own people". As for the German-born anti-Nazis, is a man to submit to a tyranny because the tyrants have seized control of his land? Are justice and righteousness nothing? "Surely I have seen the blood of Naboth and the blood of his sons, and I will requite thee." Not even the House of David could command allegiance when it oppressed the people. "What portion have we in David? Neither have we inheritance in the son of Jesse. To your tents, O Israel!" "What more deadly enemies had France in the days of Louis XIV than the persecuted Huguenots? In war as in industry, the Protestant exiles were a great source of strength to the countries which received them. Frenchmen drilled the armies of Peter the Great, a Huguenot became Commander-in-Chief in Denmark, Schomberg led the armies of England. In England three regiments were formed for the service of King William." Were the de Gaullists, as Petain said, "rebels against their Fatherland"? "To one who loves his fatherland", G. K. Chesterton declared, "our boasted indifference to the ethics of a national war is mere mysterious gibberish. It is like telling a man that a boy has committed murder, but that he need not mind because it is

only his son. 'My country, right or wrong', is a thing no patriot would think of saying except in a desperate case." "We are too willing to believe that the gang of politicians which happens to be in power is the State", writes St. John Ervine, "and they having authority to punish those who deny their infallibility, are more likely to claim that a wrong done to them is a wrong done to the people." Of course, he does not mean that we are all to refuse loyalty to the State because a different party than that which we support happens to have a majority in Parliament. What the Nazis did in Germany was something fundamentally revolting to all decent-minded people. What loyalty can a man give to that? I am told that all Germans now deny to our soldiers that they ever were Nazis. All the Nazis seem to have been killed in battle! Except when a new Nazi conspiracy is discovered in Germany.

And the centre of Nazism was anti-semitism. Rauschning records that in one of his conversations with him Hitler said: "Anti-semitic propaganda in all countries is an almost indispensable medium for the extension of our political campaign. It is beyond question the most important weapon in my propaganda arsenal and almost everywhere of deadly efficiency."

You tell me that Mosley was driven to anti-semitism by the Jews. Are you sure that Hitler's success with anti-semitism in Germany did not influence him to take the same road? I had a friend in the New Party when Mosley founded it, and I know how he was driven to leave it, because of the growing anti-semitism. Peter Howard, who was also there, with Harold Nicolson, reminds us that "these were the days when Mosley was declaring his opposition to Fascism and all its ideology. Also he described British Fascists of that day as 'blackshirted buffoons making a cheap imitation of Italian ice-cream sellers'." Then "soon the New Party was in difficulties. Funds were

declining. Mosley's thoughts began to turn to Fascism, which Harold Nicolson and I, detested. Mosley's shirt darkened as day followed day. Presently Nicolson picked his hat off the peg. I was handed mine, and we both walked out of the New Party together."

You told me some years ago what you repeat now about the "intelligent Jew who was himself drawn to the idea of a Jewish Fascism in Palestine", who wagered with you, "that within two years at most Mosley will be forced into anti-semitism by the Jews". I knew the man you meant when you first mentioned him to me, several years before the war, and I asked him about it. He denied that he had said it. I asked him again a few days ago, and he again denies it. What he said was something altogether different, he tells me. He insisted that it was inherent in what Mosley was doing that he should sooner or later be driven by his own process of thought into anti-semitism.

And common anti-semitism bred sympathy for Nazi Germany, and led Joyce and others to help Germany. You say that I have named only four or five or six traitors like Joyce and Amery, whose driving passion was hatred of Jews. You know there were many more than five or six. I don't think it is necessary to name them all. And did you notice how in all the trials of Englishmen charged with working for the Germans the approach was always through anti-semitism?—"Hughes expressed his willingness to write anti-Jewish talks to be broadcast to England."

Do you remember two members of the B.U.F. being sent to prison during the war because of letters they wrote to each other, in which these words were reported to have occurred: "My heart goes out to those men on the *Graf Spee*, heroes fighting for the cause, every one of them. I should have liked to see matters reversed. It will go down in the annals of history as an epic of National Socialism."

To them, National Socialism was more important than Britain.

Even now, with Germany defeated, sympathy with National Socialism leads Leese and others of his Fascist League, to help German P.O.W.'s to get away (not as a matter of advocating a certain policy of releasing prisoners but of plotting in Scarlet Pimpernel fashion to spirit away the King's enemies held in lawful custody). They have a more sinister motive than those other "friends of Germany" for whom a man like Victor Gollancz speaks. I don't like these others either. Germany came much too near to winning the war for us to forget the danger, and the things they did in the process of winning it ought to keep alive in us a healthy robust hatred of them. I agree with Major Lestock-Reid, when he writes: "It does not seem to have occurred to Mr. Victor Gollancz to say to the voluble German youths whom he interviewed— 'Your leaders plunged the world into war. You and the vast majority of Germans backed them vociferously while they were winning. Now you come whining to Democracy or me or anyone else who you think may be fool enough to listen to you.' "

Do you think that if the Germans had come to England as they came to France and Belgium and Holland and Norway, the anti-semitic Fifth Column would by and large not have been as ready to collaborate as its fellows were in those countries? Individual exceptions, Jew-hating sturdy British patriots there would have been, of course. But for most anti-semites Germany was treating the Jews as they should be treated. Therefore Germany should be helped to extend its good work of ridding the world of the Jews. A resistance movement there would of course have been, no matter how strong the Germans might be, but the mass of the people anywhere are not active resisters of anything. They fall in with the general

drift. Most of the 2,300 people in this country, headed by Churchill and Attlee, who constituted Hitler's first list of death-camp victims, with only about 150 Jews included, among whom I was proud to find myself, would no doubt have been got out of the way very quickly, leaving the resistance without its natural leaders. I am sure others would soon have emerged, but for a time there would have been Englishmen in command of a collaborationist administration. Was there no sympathy with Hitler in Mosley's mind that led him to write in the early days of the war: "I conclude with my simple political message, born of a deep and unchanging faith—Make Peace with British Empire intact and her people safe." What would Churchill and the great majority of English people, as long as they were still unconquered and free to fight, have called that "deep and unchanging faith"?

It is no part of my argument, Chesterton, that all Jews are good, honest, kind and lovable. There are many Jews I detest. And when you tell me that you have rarely heard of Jews associated with the darker crimes—murder, robbery, sexual offences and the rest, I wonder if you are only trying to suggest that Jews haven't the guts for violence, and confine themselves to the shady, slinking crimes, like fire-raising and fraudulent bankruptcies. Well, I'll make you a present of a batch of Jewish rogues, murderers, robbers, pimps and the rest. Buckle told us that in every group of society there are constantly moral disturbances, so that no matter what you do, a certain number of people will rob and murder and commit suicide. There was Stinie Morrison, who was convicted of murder. (It is interesting, as showing what sort of Jew he was, that when Judge Darling sentenced him to death and recommended "the Lord have mercy on your soul", Stinie Morrison answered, "I decline such mercy. I don't believe there is a God.") In America there were



those two horrible homicides, Leopold and Loeb, and there were a number of Jews in the American killer gangs. Dr. Elkan Adler records a trial for burglary and murder in which several Jews appeared before Sir John Fielding at Bow Street in 1771. "The Synagogue authorities seem to have done their best to discover the criminals and bring them to justice", a newspaper of that day wrote. "The Synagogue has much credit with the public for its activity in apprehending the miscreants lately executed."

I am not going to say that no Jews raised fires or arranged fraudulent bankruptcies. But I am sure their proportion is not larger than in any other section of the commercial community. The history of incendiarism includes the burning of the Temple, of the Alexandria Library, of Nero's Rome, Guy Fawkes's attempt to blow up the Houses of Parliament, the Reichstag Fire and the bonfires of books in Germany. The Tooley Street fire in 1861 caused a loss of about £2,000,000. And the records of the Fire Insurance Companies tell of many serious acts of incendiarism, in which the Jewish part, if only because of the lesser Jewish numbers, must have been slight. Harassed shopkeepers and "get-rich" businessmen have been defrauding the fire insurance and burglary insurance companies without any reference to their religious connections or racial affiliations. Take the crime reports for any year, and see how many prosecutions there are for arson, fraud, blackmail, forgery, food adulteration, perjury, embezzlement. You will find some Jewish names, but most are not Jewish. I met Abrahams and Cohen, Dobrowski and Greenbaum, but I also found O'Connor and Sharpe, Johnson and Hawley, Moynihan and Palmer, pages of such names. "If one is hungry and cannot oneself produce bread or find at quite short notice someone who will give one bread in exchange for something which one is able to offer him, instinct will compel one to beg or

borrow a loaf—one might be tempted to steal one,” Lord Bradbury writes in *The Times*. The low standard of commercial morality of which you speak is found in more places than you admit. All Eastern and Southern Europe have been regarded as not very reliable in that respect. The common talk about the low commercial morality of Levantines, Greeks and Turks and Syrians, and of the Balkan peoples, Roumanians and Byzantines, does not derive from the business activities of only the Jews in those countries. Even there, I find that writers on these countries draw a distinction between the businessmen and the peasants. “The peasant can’t juggle bonds or pass bad cheques, because he hasn’t any; he can’t claim false bankruptcy, nor can he pack his things and start a new racket somewhere else under an assumed name. So all crimes germane to larceny are rare or impossible among the peasants. But the peasant wherever he can will cheat those he considers the enemies of the peasantry, the merchant, the tax-collector, the State monopoly.”

As I write, James Agate has a reference in one of his articles to “money-grubbing Sicilian peasants”. And H. W. Freeman, in a novel of English farm life has this passage describing the feeling of his farmer about the people round him: “Benjamin Geaiter was suspicious of all men alike, farmers, shopkeepers, landlords, lawyers, parsons: he felt that they were all ready to cheat him if he only gave them the opportunity.”

What you are trying to avoid is the realization that every group of human beings, Jews like the rest, is a “teeming world of averagely sensual, averagely kindly, averagely cruel, averagely honest, averagely imbecile human beings.” I wish Jews were better than others. They should be. As adherents of Judaism they should be a Kingdom of Priests. But no group of people as a whole lives up to its ideals. And there are some Jews as base as

any human beings can be. We all deplore what happened in Germany to the Jews. But even when we saw it coming, Jews did not all shut their eyes to the fact that there were also some ugly specimens among German Jewry. Marvin Lowenthal in an article which appeared in a Jewish periodical about the different classes of Jews in Germany did not leave out "the bull-necked cattle who feed regularly at Berg's, on Charlottenstrasse, Berlin. The word 'profiteer' doesn't come within a mile of describing them, or even hinting at the creases of flesh above their collars, the gold cables that gird the amplitude beneath or the sheer indecency of their prosperity. I wanted to eat in Berg's for the same reason they did—because the food was excellent—but I figured that when the pogrom starts it's going to start there, and while I don't mind being butchered, I at least want to go down in worthy and congenial company. It would be too ironical to weigh what I do, and get stuck for being a swine." But these were not the whole of German Jewry. Nor is this kind of piggishness found only among this kind of Jew. There are human pigs in all classes of society, in all countries and in all groups. The word "gourmand" was not brought into the dictionary as a synonym for Jews. Nor was the word "guzzler". Here is a newspaper item about life to-day in Spain: "There was a big wedding lunch at the hotel yesterday, the wedding of the son of the General de los Monteros. The bride in a tremendous flowing dress of white satin was surrounded by a twittering cluster of women, richly overdressed. The fifty guests went into lunch about three o'clock, a lunch which ran through hors d'oeuvres, foie gras, lobster, chicken, strawberries and cream, cakes. And red and white wine and champagne. This cost the host around £15 a head."

At the same time I can understand people who come across the objectionable kind of Jew snorting with disgust

when they are told that Jews are a body of people following a high ethical religion, which gave the world the Ten Commandments and the ideals of the Prophets. I see what people mean when they say, "Personally I don't care if they believed in totem poles. But to use their religion as a cloak for their repulsive personality and habits—What has religion to do with that?" But Judaism is still a sacred religion, even if many of its nominal adherents render it but lip service, and in their lives are not truly its followers. The Synagogue, the Rabbi and the Jewish prayer-book are meaningless except in terms of religion. The central point of a Jew's life and death is the daily repeated declaration of faith: "Hear O Israel, the Lord thy God is One." The closing prayer in every Synagogue service and every private devotion is the "Oleinu", a prostration in awe before God. It is followed by two hymns—"Yigdal", the thirteen articles of Jewish belief, of the nature of God and His presence, and "Adon Olam", which George Borrow among others translated, ending with this cry of trust: "God is with me. I shall not fear." How, this being so, can anyone who has "no more interest in the Jewish religion than in any other creed" and "as a Marxian Socialist holds that religion is opium for the people" honestly call himself and be considered a Jew?

That there are many people who call themselves Jews who rarely enter a Synagogue or pray is no more than to say that there are many who call themselves Christians who rarely enter a church or pray. It is our loose way of talk; we are so vague in defining very definite things. "I cannot see that the average Englishman (leaving out members of the Catholic Church) has any claim to be considered less un-Christian than the Jews", Lord Alfred Douglas has written. "The average Englishman is simply not interested in Christianity." If you say that even among those who are observant religious Jews there are some who

commit this fault and that, the answer is given by another Roman Catholic, Michael Williams, Editor of *The Commonwealth*, defending his own people and his own priests against that charge. "These things happen because 'Men, not angels, do the work of the Church'." Do you remember Mr. Catfield in Mark Rutherford's *Autobiography*? "Mr. Catfield believed himself to be very orthodox, and in his way was very pious. I could never call him a hypocrite. He was as sincere as he could be, and yet no religious expression of his was ever so sincere as the most ordinary expression of the most trifling pleasure or pain." "Forgive us, Our Father, for we have sinned", is not only a Jewish prayer. Thomas à Kempis has it: "There is no man without fault, no man without burden, no man sufficient to himself, no man wise enough to himself, but we must bear together, comfort together, help together." Mark Rutherford again puts it very effectively when he deals with the argument that there should be no sin, no evil. "On whatever lines the world may be framed, there must be a distinction, difference, a higher and a lower; and the lower, relatively to the higher must always be an evil. Without shade the universe would be objectless, and in fact invisible."

It is certainly a lie to say that those Jews to whom Judaism matters are in a kind of conniving conspiracy to cover up the faults and misdeeds of others who are or were Jews, because on the one side stand all of "Jewish blood", and on the other all "Goyim". Zangwill went too far when he argued that a man like Zola by his passion for justice "was essentially a Jew", but he was certainly nearer the spirit of Judaism than the adherents of the Jewish "blood theory". "What would make the Jewish martyrs of old turn in their graves would be to read atheistic articles by Jerusalem journalists", he wrote, "or to witness the crusades in Palestine against the Holy Sabbath. The

Jewish martyrs went to the stake for the unity of God not for the unity of Jewry." There is no such "unity of Jewry". When Max Nordau battered the heads of the decadents, he made no distinction between those of them who were Jews and those of them who were not Jews. He trounced them all alike. When Franz Werfel said things which sounded to Jewish ears as though he had turned his back on Judaism as a creed and a belief, and had sought solace in Christianity, a Jewish writer did not hesitate for all his eminence to declare: "He has excluded himself from membership in the Jewish community. For us Jews he is no longer a Jew." If that could be said of one who in his beliefs approximated to another faith, how much more so should it be said of Jews whose conduct in daily life departs from all that is fundamental in Jewish law and ethics, and in all spiritual belief, Jewish and Christian?

If the thought comes to you again of a Jewish conspiracy, in which all Jews stand together with all other Jews, ponder the story of Max Kohler, a prominent American Jew who, when some Jewish organizations in America boosted a certain Haym Solomon, as having done great things for the American Revolution, and wanted to erect a statue to him, published a pamphlet *Pricking the Haym Solomon Bubble*. "We have a fundamental obligation to our country," he wrote. "My sense of duty to my country and to the cause of historical truth have dictated my publishing the disclosures here contained."

It is stupid to try to pretend that any large section of human beings are all noble and blameless characters: it is stupid of the anti-semites to try to put Jews into the position of having to say that all Jews are, and stupid of Jewish apologists to try to argue that they are. You can, if you want to look at only one side of the human story, make out a case for destroying the whole human race. The idea once occurred to God Himself. But the case, if

there is one, concerns the whole human race, "all flesh", and not any single branch of it, Jews or Germans, Papists or Turks, or whatever else they may be. And the human story has much more to it than that. Generalizations about any group will not get us anywhere. All Scots are not astute, and all Yankees are not cheats.

What sort of business morality is it that Henry George speaks of in connection with the vast fortunes acquired by the Vanderbilts, the Astors and the Goulds? In his writings he states, "Jay Gould got his money by bulling and bearing the stock-market, by robbing people with hired lawyers and purchased judges and corrupted legislatures, from jugglery with the monetary system, from the wildcat State banks and national banking system down to the trade-dollar swindle." "The first Vanderbilt was a boatman who earned money by hard work and saved it. But it was not working and saving that enabled him to leave such an enormous fortune. It was spoliation and monopoly. As soon as he got money enough he used it as a club to extort from others their earnings. The Vanderbilt fortune no more comes from working and saving than did the fortune that Captain Kydd buried." "The first Astor made an arrangement with certain people living in his time by virtue of which his children are now allowed to tax other people's children—to demand a very large part of their earnings from many thousands of the present population of New York. If the Astors had all remained in Germany or if there had never been any Astors, the land of Manhattan Island would have been here all the same."

"Under the Counter" dealing became a wide-spread evil in war-time England. *The Times* came to the conclusion that "thus some sort of equilibrium with the ill-stocked market is preserved". "All Spain became a vast black market", *The Times* reports. In Belgium, it says, "the black market still thrives, and will continue to do so

until there is a freer and fuller inflow of goods." "Reference was made in the London discussions," it writes editorially, "to the black markets, whose existence in most European countries creates some doubt whether the shortages are as great as the official figures indicate." Nazi Germany and Vichy France were both in the grip of the black market, and in neither of them (nor in Spain) could Jews have played any part in it. King Charles's head is not the cause, Chesterton.

When a famous English writer of crook stories tells us in one of them that "it isn't because it's racing, it's because racing has many followers that the thieves follow it", he is stating the case for every group under the sun. "If a million people follow the game", he explains, "it is certain, by the law of average, a few thousand of them will be thieves—just as it is certain that sixteen thousand will have appendicitis and thirty-five thousand bronchitis. The few thousands look a lot because they are the only fellows you and I hear about."

"It is true", you write, "that the Jews cannot justifiably incur reproach for the less amiable side of our industrial history, but I am not so sure that the same thing holds good to-day. Or is the phrase 'Jewish sweat-shop' just another anti-semitic invention?" Well, talking of sweat-shops, *Alton Locke* deals with life in the tailoring sweat-shops of Kingsley's day, and they were not "Jewish" sweat-shops! Nor was Thomas Hood's *Song of the Shirt* written about a "Jewish" sweater's victims.

"Though the immigrant Jews served as raw material for the sweating system, no one suggested that they alone were responsible for what was deemed to be a particular type of industrial organization", Mrs. Sidney Webb, who conducted the investigation into East End sweating for Charles Booth, has written. "If every foreign Jew resident in England had been sent back to his birthplace,



the bulk of the sweated workers would not have been affected, whether for better or for worse."

The sweat-shop was the result of the industrial conditions of the time, and factory legislation and improved conditions of life put an end to it. The 1932 New Survey of London Life and Labour makes a brief reference to "the present position of the Jewish Community in East London to which forty years ago many of the evils of 'sweating' and poverty were attributed", and declares: " 'Sweating', in the sense used in Charles Booth's volumes, has ceased to be a major cause of poverty in East London, and it is certain that the Trades Boards Act has played an important part in the transformation which has taken place."

Nor is "the average cinema film, crooning, jazz, the decayed music hall", the contribution of the Jew to the life of the world or "manifestations of the Jewish spirit". I happen to detest the average cinema film, crooning and jazz. St. John Ervine in one of his books pays me the compliment of saying that I am "more likely to be seen in a Synagogue than in a cinema". But I sometimes wonder if St. John Ervine, you and I and others like us are not behaving too much like the supercilious intellectual in regard to the entertainment of the masses. General Hays, the chief controller of the film industry in America, writes with pride of what it has achieved in "the history of American business". There are not only Jews in the industry, and Hollywood is not a "Jewish" but an American manifestation. Most of the big producers like Cecil de Mille and Hitchcock and Cavalcanti and Disney are not Jews, nor are most of the "stars". And the people enjoy the "pictures". "Most of the stories are enacted in the great realm of Cardboardia", writes Dr. Sherwood Taylor in *The Century of Science*, "and the technicians are very easily satisfied with their representation of scenes distant in

space or time. None the less, the cinema is an art. We must regret that the audience it addresses is the least educated and most simple-minded American, whose form of humour consists rather in cheapening and debunking, than in the subtlety of character study which characterizes the native English entertainment of the music hall. The emotional effect is very strong. By those of small critical faculty the emotion is projected upon the actor, whence come those expressions of mass-hysteria that are encouraged by the less critical newspapers. Hence also the innumerable periodicals devoted to film personalities, and the film-star moustaches that sit so oddly on our English young men. The effect of the imitation of film-stars is however not undesirable: it has cleaned up our young men, and has gone far towards improving the coiffure, complexion, hands and clothes of the working girl, the revolution in whose appearance is one of the most obvious differences between the world of 1910 and that of 1930."

And all films are not bad. Even I who go rarely to the cinema have seen films that I remember with artistic satisfaction. I don't dance, and I hate jazz. But I have no musical training or ability. And Constant Lambert who knows much more about it than I do, writes: "Apart from its psychological qualities *per se* (and of course its suitability for dancing) jazz has an amazingly rich store of associations that must not be discounted when we are considering its popular appeal. If we narrow our view from the social side of jazz to its purely technical side, we find qualities of so high an order that it is hardly surprising if many people are inclined to form rather exaggerated hopes of its possible future development. The virtuosity displayed both in the orchestration and performance of jazz is indeed little short of amazing, and at a time when the more serious forms of music seem gradually

to be sinking into a slovenly amateurishness, the thoroughly slick efficiency of popular music cannot be too highly praised. It is no exaggeration to say that if one wants a really perfect ensemble, whether in dancing, singing or orchestral playing, one should go to such an entertainment as 'Blackbirds' rather than to the Ballet, the Opera or the Queen's Hall. Orchestration and performance apart, the best jazz often displays rhythmic and harmonic ingenuities of the greatest interest." It doesn't make me like jazz any better, but there seems to be more to it than you and I understand.

And what evidence have you for saying of the Jew who is "prominently associated with these things" that it is "nearly always at their lowest level"? I read for example that "no man did more to enhance the dignity of the cinema than Irving Thalberg". Jazz band leaders and players and crooners and composers, cinema directors and "stars" and "fans" are of all sorts. These things are general crazes in which Jews are caught up just like other people. It's like the craze of red lips and red nails, which St. John Ervine found "universal", "in Asia Minor, in Syria and Palestine, no less than in England, France and Spain".

The trouble lies in the advance of science. Aldous Huxley deals with the point. "In place of the old pleasures demanding intelligence and personal initiative, we have vast organizations that provide us with ready-made distractions—distractions which demand from pleasure-seekers no personal participation and no intellectual effort of any sort. To the interminable democracies of the world a million cinemas bring the same stale balderdash. There have always been fourth-rate writers and dramatists; but their works in the past quickly died, without getting beyond the boundaries of the city or the country in which they appeared. To-day the inventions of the scenario-

writer go out from Los Angeles across the whole world. Countless audiences soak passively in the tepid bath of nonsense. No mental effort is demanded of them, no participation; they need only sit and keep their eyes open. Do the democracies want music? In the old days they would have made it themselves. Now they merely turn on the gramophone. Or they adjust the wireless to the right wave-length." Would you carry out the ideas of Erewhon, and have all machines and treatises on mechanics destroyed, "thus cutting the mischief out root and branch"?

Scientific development opens up opportunities for making big money, whether by producing films or manufacturing motor cars or aeroplanes. People who have a taste and the ability for such things, Jew or Gentile, red haired or eagle nosed, Yankee or Scotsman, exploit these opportunities. And people who make a good thing out of these opportunities try to protect their interests. I believe the really big people in the tobacco industry are not Jews, the Wills family for instance. I have just seen a denunciation by a doctor of the smoking habit, as one of the causes of the increase of nervous illness. "Dr. Tremellen said there were three causes—fear of not being thought modern, fear of having to face life without the dulling effect of smoking, and the fact that immense financial interests were involved."

The love of money, not merely wanting to do one's job and earn one's living, as you and I do, is found in all sections of the community. Even where it cannot be indulged in business, the trait exists. So A. J. A. Symons, for example, tells us of Robert Hugh Benson that his weakness was "the love of money. This is no secret; the fact may be deduced from his biography."

The remedy might be to take all these things out of private hands, and to make entertainment the job of a

Ministry of Education and Fine Arts. Only would there not then arise a new crop of evils? Already it is complained of the B.B.C. that "running through the whole of the programmes is a faint tinge of the official".

I cannot follow your reasoning, Chesterton, when you ask, "the works of individual Jews of genius admitted, what contribution has corporate Jewry made to the culture of mankind since it was uprooted from its own soil nearly two thousand years ago", and go on to suggest that Jewry's corporate contribution at the present day is crooning and jazz. Why is crooning and jazz the contribution of corporate Jewry more than are the contributions of the individual Jews of genius? I could tell you a great deal about the contributions which corporate Jewry has made to the cultural life of the world during the two thousand years since the destruction of the Temple, not only by individual Jews, but by the great body of Jewish life as a whole. The "Golden age" of Spanish Jewry was not confined to a few individuals. And Hasidism as a movement was a creation of the Jewish folk spirit, whose importance in religious thought and in poetry has not yet been fully evaluated. Yiddish folk song and Yiddish literature, and Jewish scholarship in Germany are contributions by corporate Jewry of no small value. Jews did not stand still and remain uncreative in these two thousand years, and Judaism has developed since the days of the Temple.

But your question about the film remains. And in so far as some Jews in the film industry are concerned, will you tell me how I am more responsible for Warner Brothers or for Samuel Goldwyn than you are for Mr. Rank.

I commend to you Ezekiel: "Because he did iniquity, he shall die in his iniquity. Yet say ye, why? doth not the son bear the iniquity of his father? When the son hath

done that which is lawful and right, he shall surely live. The soul that sinneth it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son." It seems to me more sensible than your generalizations—Jew this and Gentile that. We are all human individuals. Because Bardolph and Doll Tearsheet exist, everyone is not a Bardolph or a Doll Tearsheet. Because Quilp is an English type and Forsyte is an English type every Englishman is not a Quilp or a Forsyte. It is true of us all that "in the same land poor weeds, rich corn, gay flowers together stand".

I have not read your "brilliant" Max Mundlack. But speaking as a writer myself, I should stop writing at once if I thought that every stupid remark I might happen to get printed somewhere was going to be used to bolster up someone's mad accusations against a whole body of people, Jews or non-Jews, about whom my judgment cannot possibly be the final irrefutable word on the subject.

I don't think you would accept as evidence all that has been said about the English people by some very important English writers. Take Wells. Think of Tono Bungay, the money-making patent medicine which was "a string of lies and a trade in bottles of unmitigated water". Or in *Kipps*, the description of English Society—"they are ugly and cowardly and mean. Look at their women! Painted, dyed and drugged, hiding their ugly shapes under a load of dress. There isn't a woman in the swim of Society at the present time who wouldn't sell herself body and soul, who wouldn't lick the boots of a Jew or marry a nigger rather than live decently on a hundred a year! On what would be wealth for you and me! They know it. They know we know it! No one believes in them, in nobility any more." Meredith's *One of Our Conquerors* "is one of the books that have made me", Wells tells us. "It was the first detached and adverse criticism of the

Englishman I had ever encountered." Or read Galsworthy about the *Forsytes*. "You talk of them as if they were half England." "They are half England, and the better half too, the safe half, the three per cent half, the half that counts. It's their wealth and security that makes everything possible, makes art possible, makes literature, science, even religion possible. Without Forsytes, who believe in none of these things but turn them all to use, where should we be?"

The sentence you quote from Mundlack's book is nonsense. He may feel like that. I don't. It is certainly not the Jewish attitude to such things.

"Is there still in Jewish religious teaching the laying down of one law for the Jew and another for the Gentile?" you ask. "In other words, has the Talmud been rejected?" And you repeat the lie that the Talmud "depicts the Gentile as a hewer of wood and a drawer of water, an inferior creature without rights, to be exploited and despoiled as the Jews desire".

It would be easy of course to say that the Talmud is an ancient book, outmoded as some Christians say of the writings of the Church Fathers. "Enlightened" Jews do it. Here for example is Laurie Magnus, in his book *The Jews in the Christian Era*—"The Pharisaic code was the work of many generations. It might happen too that one casuist would find a way out of an impasse in which another casuist had tied himself, and the consequent threat to morality is obvious. That all these evils ensued, and that the completed Talmud in either version yields indisputable spoils to the searcher for ill-intentioned word-play, for ambiguous meanings, equivocal ratiocination, ungrounded expediency and the like, is not to be denied. But the whole thing", he proceeds, "has another side, a better side, and veritably the truer side. The Talmud has the defects of its qualities, but the defects belong

to the written work; the qualities belong to those who make it. They made it with admirable intention, with an uncompromising desire to do right, with an unfading and an unremitting zest to serve God only and God always."

The Rev. R. Travers Herford, who is not a Jew, takes a more kindly view of "What the World Owes to the Pharisees", in his booklet of that name. "It is a rash attempt", he writes, "to try and distil the essence of Talmudism so as to exhibit it in a single sentence."

"What is the Talmud?" asks Professor Danby, a Christian scholar, and he explains that it is a huge compilation of discussions by the Rabbis of the first three centuries of the common era, religious, legal, medical, folk-lore, historical, imaginative, speculative. It may be compared to the volumes of Hansard, recording the debates of the Rabbis, instead of members of Parliament. Many Christian scholars have studied it and defended it against attack, generally by Jewish converts to Christianity. "In particular the brothers Ratisbonne and the Chevalier Drach are continually quoted by anti-semitic writers", says the Rev. James Parkes, "and another converted Jewish priest, Father Joseph Lenauer, was one of the inspirers of the anti-semitism of the Dreyfus Affair." The story of the "Talmud Jew" goes back largely to the German Eisenmenger. "The fact that his scholarship was extremely faulty", says Parkes, "has never deterred those who wish to cite his authority from doing so." A later German priest, Augustus Rohling, published a book called *The Talmud Jew*. "His knowledge of Hebrew was of the slightest", according to Parkes, "for most of the material was taken over and often misunderstood from Eisenmenger." The Talmud is there for examination, and famous Christian scholars, Noeldeke, Strack, George Foot Moore, Travers Herford and others, are authorities on it. They have repudiated the accusations which seem to have



impressed you. Dr. Joseph Bloch wrote a book dealing specifically with Rohling's charges, and brought an action against Rohling. The Court appointed Professor Noeldeke and Professor Wuensche as experts. The end was that Rohling withdrew his charges, was sentenced by the Court to pay the costs, and he resigned his post at Prague University.

Here is a Talmudic passage translated by Noeldeke and Wuensche, and quoted in Bloch's book: "It is written (Deut. vi, 5) And thou shalt love the Lord thy God, i.e. thou shalt strive to win the goodwill of thy fellow-men. And thou art to beware of overreaching and robbery, be it of an Israelite, be it of a Goy, or of any man whatsoever." In *A Rabbinic Anthology* by Dr. Claude Montefiore and Dr. Herbert Loewe, the translation reads: "Commenting on the first verse of the Shema (Deut. vi, 5) 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God', the Yalkut says: 'See that thou art beloved by human beings and keep thyself far from sin and theft from Jew, Gentile or any man.' "

It is terrible to compare the true translations of Talmudic passages with the distorted translations that appear in *The Talmud Jew* and other anti-semitic writings. "That it is forbidden to overreach a Gentile the Talmudists derive from Lev. xxv, 47. Rabbi Yehuda says: 'It is forbidden to keep a measure in one's house that is either too small or too large.' Maimonedes considers false measure and weight as theft. He says 'It is one and the same whether he deals with an Israelite or an idolater; if he gives short measure he trespasses against a prohibition and is bound to make restitution; likewise it is forbidden to lead the Goy into making a mistake in settling accounts.' 'For all that do such things, and all that do unrighteously are an abomination unto the Lord thy God.' "

I am not a Talmudic scholar. And this is not my province. There are the Christian Professors of Theology,

to whom the Talmudic Books are accessible, who study them and know them. "Those who wish can easily learn them", writes Professor Danby. "They are quite accessible."

This is a stupid idea that every Jew is all the time busy trying to get the better of some innocent unsuspecting Christian. Life doesn't go on in that way. The strain of keeping up the eternal Jewish conspiracy, if there were such a thing, would have driven every Jew mad long ago, and there would have been an end of us. The essence of secrecy is—secrecy, you say. Try keeping a secret among such a vast number of people, or even among the select body of "leaders", rent by all sorts of differences and personal jealousies. We are both journalists, Chesterton. Human nature is no different among Jews than among other people. There are more real problems that need tackling.

I won't say that there are no Jewish hypocrites and casuists, who split hairs to find a theological argument to justify some dubious act, but casuistry and self-righteous hair-splitting is found in all sects, among some Christians as among some Jews. The fault is in the casuists, not in the religion.

"In a city where there are both Jews and Gentiles, the collectors of alms collect both for Jews and for Gentiles; they feed the poor of both, visit the sick of both, bury both, comfort the mourners, whether Jews or Gentiles, and they restore the lost goods of both. Where danger to life is concerned, one does not enquire whether Jews or Gentiles are involved." There you have a passage from the Talmud.

I was present at a meeting of a Jewish relief organization, at which the Chief Rabbi was in the chair. The question was raised whether the relief supplies provided by funds contributed by Jews for Jewish populations liberated from Nazi occupation could be distributed indiscrimin-

ately among all the people. The Chief Rabbi explained that about 1,800 years ago, in the time of Rabbi Gamaliel, there had been great suffering, and Rabbi Gamaliel had laid it down as a Jewish Law that all people who suffer must be given equal treatment; that there must be no distinction between Jew and Gentile. Because if we disregard the call of common humanity, he said, society as a whole must collapse.

Rabbi Samson Raphael Hirsch in his *Nineteen Letters on Judaism* stresses that the Sabbath must be kept. "But what about intercourse with non-Jews?" he asks. "We shall be drawing attention to ourselves. We shall be recognized immediately as Jews. Who is telling you to deny that you are a Jew?" he goes on. "Be a Jew, be a Jew truly, seek it in the fulfilment of the Jewish commands of justice and love, so that you will be respected because you are a Jew, not though you are a Jew. You will not have to complain that you did not keep your Judaism incognito. Be just in word and deed; carry love in your heart towards your non-Jewish brethren, as the Jewish Law teaches you, feed their hungry, clothe their naked, help their sick, comfort their suffering, give counsel to those who need it, act towards them as a Jew should, and will they not respect you?"

So when you write, "My heart goes out to you when you say that what is wanted is not less but more Jewishness," in spite of the back-kick about Jews keeping out of English affairs, which follows, I feel that perhaps there, as you say, is the possibility of a bridge of understanding being built between us. For though I don't like it, I could understand it if England as a Christian country would insist that only Christians should take an active part in its affairs. Just a hundred years ago, in the House of Commons, Sir R. Inglis was opposing the Bill for the full enfranchisement of the Jews on that ground, that England ought to be a land

of Christians and that the identity of the British Constitution with Christianity should not be in any way destroyed.

A Jew to whom Judaism is more important than emancipation, however important that may be, will understand the attitude. I think Macaulay effectively answered Inglis on that occasion. But that emancipation holds a danger for Judaism is certain. When Russification became an ideal with the Jews of Russia "the Jewish youth began to shatter the old idols", says Professor Dubnov, in his *History of the Jews in Russia*. "A tragic war ensued between fathers and children", and the result of the shattering of the old idols was "the renunciation of the religious and national traditions of Judaism." No wonder Rabbi Shneur Zalman opposed Napoleon because he felt his gift of civic rights to the Jews might lead to a disintegration of the religious life. "Civic rightlessness under Czar Alexander was preferable, so long as it preserved the inviolability of Judaism."

But modern civilization seems to be going in another direction. In the little book, *A Christian Basis for the Post-War World*, which I have mentioned, Sidney Dark writes in the chapter "Minorities", "The tiniest minority, say, the Russian Doukhobours in Canada, may properly be permitted to worship God in their own way." And what of the state of Christianity in England? The Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London recently complained that the great mass of the English people is no longer Christian. The General of the Salvation Army has written to *The Times*, urging a religious revival, "accepting the truth that 'the vast majority of English people need to be converted to Christianity'".

St. John Ervine tells us that he asked a number of people, none of whom was what is called an "intellectual", whether or not he believed in the doctrine of the Trinity. Not one of them did. They shared his belief that the lar-

gest single sect in Great Britain is composed of unofficial Unitarians, who are to be found in almost every Christian organization. "The most active and powerful minds of today are no longer religious, and the religion which formerly lay at the back of the mind of every man of affairs is absent from those who will be our children's rulers", writes Dr. Sherwood Taylor. "A large part of the world has now adopted a negative creed, as little supported by the findings of Science as is the positive creed of the religious. The public seems to believe that a materialistic philosophy has been established by the findings of Science. Science is materialistic inasmuch as all its data are material events and can therefore give no information about anything but matter. For Science to affirm or deny the existence of the soul would be as absurd as for Religion to affirm or deny the Law of Conservation of Energy. If a man allows his whole existence to be guided by Science, he will be a materialist, but if he chooses to be so guided it is not the fault of Science. It would seem that the fallacy that materialism is a proven truth has infected a great part of the civilized world, and has probably gone far to contribute to the disintegration of moral values."

You know of a large number of Jews, you tell me, "who are engaged—one, at least, professionally—in the task of trying to break down Gentile faith in Christianity". You probably mean Chapman Cohen, of *The Freethinker*. But his predecessor was Foote, and before him there was Bradlaugh. And there was Ingersoll, and at the back of them all was Tom Paine. There are a number of "Jews" in the Rationalist Press Association, some of them like Harold Laski in leading positions. But look through their list of active prominent members, and see how many others there are.

To us Jews atheism is the same danger as it is to Christians. I could fill a dozen pages with solemn de-

nunciations uttered by Rabbis and religious Jews against the atheistic spirit which, coming not from within Judaism, but from outside, from the growing materialistic rationalist philosophy which had its origin in the ideas that inspired the French Revolution, is undermining and destroying Jewish life. "Confronted with the daring rationalism of modern Europe Judaism became conscious of two perplexing questions", Rabbi Berkovits writes in a recent book. "The first was theological, the critical question as to the truth of the religious teachings and traditions. The results of modern historical research and scientific progress, the new conceptions of the workings of nature, all tended to undermine fundamental religious beliefs which were deeply rooted in Bible and Talmud." "An atheist may reach the summit of excellence in his sphere, and his excellence may be of outstanding benefit to the world. But from Judea it does not spring. A Jew who no longer believes in God and who does not live the Jewish life is no Jew." This was written by a Jewish scholar, the late Dr. Herbert Loewe.

Modern life has been a disintegrating influence both upon Judaism and upon Christianity. It has tended to make people shallow, to make them look for new standards and to despise the old. Nearly a hundred years ago, when the process was in its beginnings, George Borrow saw it "breaking up our venerable communities", not only the Jewish, but also those of other minority, dissenting groups, like the Quakers. "It is making the wealthy Jews forsake the Synagogue for the opera house or the gentility chapel", he wrote. "It is making them abandon their ancient literature, their Mishna, their Gemara, their Zohar, for gentility novels. It makes poor Jews, male and female, forsake the Synagogue for the sixpenny theatre or penny hop; the Jew to take up with an Irish female of loose character, and the Jewess with a musician of the Guards. The young Jew

marries an opera dancer or the cast-off Miss of the honourable Spencer So-and-So. It makes the young Jewess accept the honourable offer of a cashiered lieutenant. With respect to the Quakers, it makes the young people like the young Jews crazy after gentility, diversions, worship, marriages or connections, and makes old Pease thrust himself into society which could well dispense with him, and out of which he is not kicked, because he is not poor."

These influences do not come from within Judaism or Quakerism, but from outside. And when I say that the remedy lies in more Judaism and not in less, I mean that we must set up fences and dykes against these influences which undermine our true Jewish qualities, and reduce Judaism to a colourless imitation of what George Borrow calls the Christianity of Mr. Platitude.

Your method of attributing every evil to the Jews leaves out of account the hurt and the suffering which these evils bring to Jews, and how in our own Jewish interests we fight and must fight against them.

They are general diseases, which afflict us all, and against which we must all unite, instead of fighting each other, as though one's right leg could get along better by kicking and bruising the left leg all the time. Where does atheism derive from? "The great French writers by the middle of the eighteenth century succeeded in sapping the foundations of the Church", says Buckle, and he proceeds to tell us that "atheism was openly advocated by Condorcet, by D'Alembert, by Diderot, by Helvetius, by Lalande, by Laplace, by Mirabeau and by Saint Lambert. In 1746 Hume met at the house of Baron d'Holbach, a party of the most celebrated Frenchmen then residing in Paris. The great Scotchman took occasion to raise an argument as to the existence of an atheist, properly so called; for his own part, he said, he had never chanced to meet with one. 'You have been somewhat unfortunate,'

replied Holbach, 'but at the present moment you are sitting at table with seventeen of them.' " Was there a single Jew among them?

Joseph McCabe, the atheist, tells us that "we to-day proudly accept the charge that the 'philosophers' were responsible for the Revolution: not so much the Deists of the earlier generation, Voltaire and Rousseau, as the men who, like Diderot, D'Alembert and Holbach, all atheists, translated their humanitarian ideals into practicable proposals and protests."

Have you found any Jews in England under Henry VIII who were behind his sequestration of the monasteries?

It is the wrong shape, Chesterton. Do you remember that Father Brown story? The whole thing was wrong. "It was a mean shape. It was a wrong shape." How can you write things with such a mean shape? Your suggestions about Jews conspiring to create a "Jewish" world-dominating League of Nations, your talk about the "Talmud Jew", about the different morality of the Jews towards Christians, about the Jews as such being a commercially dishonest people, about the "Jewish" urge towards the enslavement and degradation of the Christian nations, your notions about "international Jewish high finance" and the Jews as organizers of Revolution, your idea that Zionism is not really concerned with establishing a Jewish State, whose purpose would be to normalize the position and the life of the Jews, but to dominate the world, they all come back to the type of anti-semitic mysticism which is Houston Chamberlain's, which is Alfred Rosenberg's, which is Goebbels's, which is Streicher's, which is Hitler's. You will find the whole crooked, mad, miserable story in Rosenberg's book *The Myth of the Twentieth Century*.

You may take your beliefs wherever you choose, but this source is foul, it is corrupt, it is contaminated. It is the



wrong shape, Chesterton. It is the creed of militant, aggressive, pagan Germanism, seeking to conquer and enslave the world. Do you lend yourself to that?

“Luther’s great achievement”, writes Rosenberg, “was in the first place the destruction of the exotic priest-idea, and in the second place the Germanizing of Christianity. But awakening Germanism led after Luther to Goethe, Kant, Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, Lagarde. To-day it is marching with giant steps towards its full blossoming. This young generation desires no more than to see the great personality of the founder of Christianity in its proper greatness without those falsifying additions which Jewish zealots like Matthew, materialist Rabbis like Paul, African lawyers like Tertullian, or impossible mongrels like Augustine have imposed on us as a terrible spiritual ballast. We want to see the world and Christianity through Germanic values. Our coming day repudiates the centre in Rome together with the Jerusalemite Old Testament. It unites every single thing with a great firmament of racial-spiritual world-conception into a full-blooded organism of German life.”

It is not only a movement against Jews and Judaism. It is equally directed against the Roman Catholic Church which, too, “annihilates the values of race and nation”, and has “a world-wide diaspora and a world-wide domination, over which the tools of the Vatican hold sway.” The women’s emancipation movement is another of Rosenberg’s “disruptive forces”, together with democracy and parliamentarianism and Marxism.

Rosenberg had no love for the British Empire, which he tried to make his readers believe is falling to pieces, because the Dominions, South Africa, Canada and Australia, are going to secede, as the United States did. How does Rosenberg conclude his book?—“The two million Germans who died in 1914–18 in all parts of the world for the

idea 'Germany', suddenly revealed that they could cast off the entire nineteenth century. The sailor on the deck of the *Nuernberg* facing the enemy, the nameless officer on the *Magdeburg* are types and myths of heroism like the Germans who once crossed the Alps. The German spirit fights against all powers which it cannot recognize as of first and supreme value. The sacred hour of the Germans will strike."

What have you, Chesterton, to do with this, and with the propaganda methods which were designed to help to bring about a German domination of the world?

"Prussia has welded its subservient citizens into one gigantic machine of aggression", was written during the 1914 war, of the Kaiser's war. And all Hitlerism was another attempt to do what the Kaiser had failed to do. You must have seen the German document, "The Military Administration of England", which fell into our hands and was published recently. Britain would have been turned into a workshop for Germany, all males between seventeen and forty-five would have been deported to the Continent as slave labour, the pound would have been debased, and the rule of the gun would have been applied.

And it would not have stopped at the 2,300 people on the Gestapo's first black list, in which my own name is included. All who would have resisted German rule in England would have found their way with us to the slave camps and the death camps, and I hope that you would have been among the resisters.

You agree that there are no pure races, but you argue that nations do not require pure stock to be a national entity, and you say that Jews do not belong to the English national entity, and should not be allowed to participate "too freely" in the running of English affairs. You acknowledge as undeniable "the rich spiritual heritage which

England has derived from the Hebrew", but you don't want a Jewish "problem" in these islands, any more than because of the Hellenic and Roman heritage you want a Greek or Italian "problem". What is your English entity? If it does not require pure stock, as you agree it does not, what is it, beyond being born and bred in these islands, finding our place here, belonging to it as to no other place, absorbing its language, its customs, its culture? For not only is the English stock not "pure", but neither is the Jewish stock. These are not two separate and distinct "races". "In each country", writes Professor Julian Huxley in *We Europeans*, "the Jewish population overlaps with the non-Jewish in every conceivable character. The word Jew is valid more as a socio-religious or pseudo-national description (which does not imply that the Jews form a nation in the accepted sense of the word) than as an ethnic term in any genetic sense. Many 'Jewish' characteristics are without doubt much more the product of Jewish tradition and upbringing, and especially the reaction against external pressure and persecution than of heredity." This is the conclusion also of Jewish authorities. Dr. Julius Brutzkus published a very detailed study on the subject in the *Jewish Chronicle* in 1938, in which he tells us that research has shown "that the Jews of different countries do not represent a homogeneous race. This, of course, had been long ago anticipated by the anthropologists", he proceeds. "Research has refuted the belief that Jews are pure Semites and Germans pure Nordics. On the contrary it has been proved that both are products of cross-breedings. The historically-recorded proselytism explains such phenomena."

But of course you agree "there are no pure races", and you "do not take up any racial attitude, except to abominate the inter-mixture of white and coloured people". I find that anthropologists studying the question scientific-

ally are not so sure as we are about the bad effects of miscegenation. "The disapproval of miscegenation is primarily social, not biological", they say. And we see quite frequently even here in London to-day, that as they say, "far from there always existing a sexual repulsion between markedly different types, there is often a strong sexual attraction between blacks, whites and yellows". The scientists are not even sure about our "sweeping assertions that half-castes share the defects of both parent stocks". On the contrary, they think that "even if wide crosses should produce some disharmonic or maladjusted types, this will occur as the result of the great variability induced by such crosses; and this same variability may be expected to throw up also some exceptionally well-endowed types". But I am not a scientist, and I admit that I share your prejudice against it. Though Livingstone, who spent many years among primitive tribes in Africa, wrote: "I have no prejudice against their colour; indeed, anyone who lives long among them forgets that they are black and feels that they are just fellow-men." Livingstone was a Christian missionary. Mr. Basil Henriques, who tries to be a kind of Jewish missionary and has been working for over thirty years in a Jewish Settlement near the London Docks, hasn't forgotten their colour. "Seeing the black sailors with white girls always revolted me", he writes. So that we don't, Jews on one side and Christians on the other, disagree in this matter.

Is your English entity then Christian, with the result that Judaism is excluded from it as a heretic religion? Must all Englishmen conform to the National Church? That, whatever else it were, would be logical, and I have already said that if this is enforced a Jew can do nothing against it. But where will it take you? There are many others besides Jews who would have to be coerced or excluded from the national life. Milton told those who

wished "to execute the Dominican part of the Inquisition over us", that "their testy mood of prohibiting is unacceptable to God", and that "it would be no unequal distribution in the first place to suppress the suppressors themselves". And he went on: "We do not see that while we still affect by all means a rigid external formality, we may as soon fall again into a gross conforming stupidity, a stark and dead congealment of wood and hay and stubble forced and frozen together. It is not possible for man to sever the wheat from the tares, the good fish from the other fry; that must be the Angels' Ministry at the end of mortal things. Yet if all cannot be of one mind, as who looks they should be this doubtless is more wholesome, more prudent, and more Christian that all may be tolerated, rather than all compelled."

Let us speak of those born, those brought up in these islands. Do you mean to tell me that if they profess the Jewish religion they are not English, and must not participate "too freely" in the running of English affairs? "My family came over to England many centuries ago", writes Mr. Basil Henriques. "I have always felt myself to be utterly English. I know I am not deceiving myself about this. My religion is my own affair. I am a Jew, not because my parents were before me, but because every atom of my being believes in Judaism. I expect a Christian to tolerate and respect my religion in the same way as I would expect him to tolerate that of any other denomination not his own."

I find that Mr. Basil Mathews, who is engaged in Christian missionary work, writes in the same spirit: "A man's belief about the meaning of life, the faith that he chooses to live by, is a matter between himself and God. No one has any right to inflict penalties or offer rewards to induce him to accept a belief which he cannot sincerely hold. There can be no controversy between the true

Christian and the true Jew on that point. We shall all set our faces like flint against all processes of trying to dislodge the loyalty of Jews from their faith by any lures that have no relation to the actual person of Jesus Christ. Most nations to-day give their citizens free choice of religion. To embrace another faith is not national disloyalty."

I know that many of those who say they are Jews "only by religion" are not very religious, and use the phrase in the sense of lessening their adherence to Judaism, making it a half-way station on the way of getting out completely, if the chance offers. But that does not make it any less true that Judaism, as Shechter said, "is a divine religion", and that a Jew who does not believe in God and does not keep the practices of Judaism is not a Jew.

But because he is a Jew, why cannot a man be English? "British patriotism is not the medieval demand", the Chief Rabbi wrote, "that the citizens of any one country all think alike, that they be of the same blood." The French writer, Leroy-Beaulieu, in his book *Israel Among the Nations* puts it this way: "I have little taste for uniformity. My ideal of a nation is not a monolith, nor a bronze formed at a single casting. It is better that a people should be composed of diverse elements. If the Jew differs from us, so much the better; he is more likely to bring a little variety into the flat monotony of our modern civilization."

I am not pleading to be accepted, or apologizing for being different. I am a Jew. I am not a Christian. I belong to a minority. I am a nonconformist, a dissenter. And I can live only in a world which permits nonconformity, which allows people to be different. I am not writing these letters to win your favour, or to convert you to my beliefs, but because you asked me to collaborate with you in a book in which you would put your questions, and I would endeavour to answer them as best I

could, from my stance as a Jew. Unfortunately it takes more space to answer questions than to pose them, if the questions are to be dealt with at all properly. I don't want to shirk any of your questions. And there is no other way in which there may, as you suggested, "be value in this sincere attempt to explore the possibility of an understanding between Jews and their critics".

I am not going to run away with the idea that what I say is the last word on the subject or that it will satisfy you or convince you. It is a "pathetic conviction", Mr. John Palmer has reminded us, that we need "only state a case honestly and clearly and people will be convinced and thereafter remain steadfast in their opinion. It is the fallacy of a liberal-minded politician who assumes that man in the mass is governed by reason, and who ignores the conscious self-interest or what is even more potent, the irrational impulse of the crowd." You have your prejudices, and against these I can do nothing.

I am not a Zionist, but I accept as equally valid for myself what the militant Zionist Jabotinsky said about the "awareness of every Gentile that his Jewish neighbour is 'not his own kind', and of every Jew that his Aryan friends are not 'his own kind'. There is no intrinsic harm", he goes on, "in this awareness; it is no obstacle to decent neighbourly intercourse, to mutual help, even to friendship, so long as the social 'climate' is favourable." Of course, to me the awareness of the "unlikeness" lies not in any distinction of Aryan and non-Aryan, but in the different beliefs and religious practices of Jew and Christian, not in any "racial" or "national" differences between Jew and Englishman. But there is no stopping the widening of the breach once you get down to widening it. And when "Aryans" carry out a barbaric extermination policy against all "Jews" for the sole reason that they were born of Jewish parents or even of Jewish grand-

parents, whatever they believe and whatever they practise, it is not surprising to find that those who have survived the death camps come back without faith in the ideals of a common humanity, and are prepared to believe that the Jews must be indeed a separate race or nation, or perhaps even a completely separate genus. "Our enemies have made us a people in our despite", said Herzl. And also this—"Our oppression does not improve us, for we are not a whit better than other people."

Yet I can't help wondering what hope in such a world there is for a Jewish people or a Jewish nation or a Jewish State. Despite anti-semitism, and despite what has been done to the Jews in Europe, I still cannot accept the idea that Jews are something different from the rest of mankind, and that because we worship God differently than the Christians do, we must leave the lands where we were born and lived for centuries. "Have we not all one father? Hath not one God created us?"

Of course, it has happened before in history that people who were not allowed to worship God in their own way went out and founded a new nation. It is what the Pilgrim Fathers did. But the warning is there—the nation which grew on the foundations laid by the Pilgrim Fathers does not as such follow their faith. I imagine the Pilgrim Fathers would not be pleased with Hollywood and with the Chicago gangsters and the Standard Oil Trust and other manifestations of American life.

I am not trying to hide from myself the difficulties of being a Jew in a non-Jewish world. I am no "escapist". And I can understand people getting tired of being constantly at odds with their world, and longing for a place where they will be more at home. Zionists hope that Palestine will provide such a home, where Jews will live "at peace with themselves and the world". But this feeling of being at odds with the world is not confined to Jews.



Human beings all find life hard at times and difficult to fit into. Jews are not alone in inventing utopias and fairy tales, where all live happily ever after. Even the anti-semites do it, imagining vainly that all will be well with their world if only the Jews are out of it. It is all very well to say you only want a normal life. "Since the very dawn of history at least this normal social life has never been the whole complete life of mankind", writes Wells. Human life has never been frictionless, "there have been a number of forces and influences within men and women and without, that have produced abnormal and surplus ways of living, supplemental, additional and even antagonistic to this normal scheme."

Again, it is a general human problem, which goes much wider than anything that concerns the comparatively small number of Jews there are in the world. It is a problem of human diversity, of human adjustment, of struggle and conflict and the achievement always of a certain peace.

Zangwill finally came to the conclusion that only a madman would not want a normal rational solution of the Jewish problem by the establishment of a Jewish State, but that only a madman would expect it to be possible. He had been reluctantly forced to realize that "all the possibilities are only ideals, and none is easily translatable into actuality. There is no remedy", he said. "Even this", he went on, "is not a counsel of unique despair. As much might be said of countless other tragic problems of the world."

That is to say, the Jew cannot live in the world any more than any other minority without often finding things uncomfortable. It is the lot of the nonconformist, of the Protestant. And the only way to become more comfortable is to conform.

But would not the world lose by that? "All written

history is the story of a minority and their peculiar and abnormal affairs", says Wells. A Jewish thinker like Nathan Birnbaum who had been one of the early Zionists and had found that solution wanting, cries out against the very thought of wanting to make Jewish life normal, to remove from it the hardships and difficulties that make the Jew testify by his daily life to the difference between the Jew and the rest of the world—"A Kingdom of Priests you shall be unto me". And if Jews fail to live up to that high mission, so much the worse for those Jews. If it means dispersion, then he says with Isaiah—"Blessed are ye that sow beside all waters".

If the Jewish State could be a place where Judaism would be observed by the population as a whole, no Jew would question its desirability. But if the point of view put forward by Mr. Basil Mathews and others is to be accepted in England, that "a man's belief about the meaning of life, the faith that he chooses to live by, is a matter between himself and God", and that "no one has a right to inflict penalties or offer rewards to induce him to accept a belief which he cannot sincerely hold", then it must apply equally to a Jewish Palestine. If Jews are Jews by nationality, Zangwill once wrote to me, then a Jew could be an atheist or a Christian and still be a Jew. What then becomes of Jewishness and of Judaism? The old Jewish State was not a "national" State, but a theocracy. And theocracies have become extinct. Zangwill has forcibly illustrated the result of trying to revive extinct forms by reminding us of the story by H. G. Wells, of the man who hatched out the egg of one of the large extinct birds. "At first all is charm and idyll, but in a few years the creature grown colossal and terrible kicks and pummels its foster-father as with the foot of a cart-horse and a beak like a sledge-hammer. It is the fate of all who play with the past and try to revive the intellectually extinct."

And I say quite definitely that were I faced with the choice of a Jewish nation without Judaism, but as a "nation" living happily on its own soil, or a Jewish Community, living the life of a non-conforming minority in this country, with all the consequent disadvantage, not an easy, comfortable life, I would choose the life of the nonconforming Jewish religious community.

Even if Palestine were to be a land in which Judaism was the religion of the majority of the population, and every Jew everywhere would therefore be naturally interested in such a Jewish State, it still does not follow that all Jews because they observe the same religion would wish to be nationals and inhabitants of such a "Jewish State". The Jews in Spain many centuries ago were transported with joy when they heard of the existence on the shores of the Black Sea of the Chazar State, in which Judaism was the State religion, but they did not all want to go to Chazaria or adopt Chazarian nationality. It took something much more important, the decision of the Spanish State that they must become Christians or leave their country, to make them pull up their roots and go elsewhere. Every Roman Catholic does not go to live in Vatican City. And every American Wesleyan does not go to live near Wesley's Chapel in the City Road.

The question of Zionism and Palestine is not the whole question of the Jew and Judaism. There are valid Jewish objections to the idea of Judaism linking itself to another nationalism and another State, so that Judaism, a universal religion, should seem to be the exclusive possession of one country and one nation. There are valid Christian objections to the idea that anyone who has doubts about the rightness of the Palestine solution, and who thinks that it will cause trouble by creating another weak and dependent State in a natural cockpit of the world, is an anti-semite, when he is nothing of the kind, while others whose

"Zionism" is prompted by the desire to get rid of the Jews out of his own environment, is hailed as a friend of the Jews. Anti-Zionist and anti-semite are not synonymous terms. The Jewish problem is a human problem, and like all human problems has many facets. There are non-Zionist Jews whose Judaism and whose Jewishness is much stronger than that of a good many Zionists, and who would endure a great deal for their Judaism but not for Palestine. They refuse to disappear as Jews. Must all Jews accept the alternative of giving up their own citizenship for a Jewish nationality, or "assimilating", ceasing to be Jews? Why?

You say that a Jew has a "dual loyalty", since he is interested also in Jews outside this country. T. S. Eliot, the poet, has written of the similar position of Christians: "There would always remain a dual allegiance, to the State and to the Church, to one's country and to one's fellow-Christians everywhere, and the latter would always have the primacy." *The Times* published a letter from Lord Luke, on behalf of an organization called "Christian Reconstruction in Europe", appealing for funds for its work of helping suffering Christians on the Continent. He writes that the King and Queen and Field Marshal Montgomery had sent him contributions. "On behalf of the Christians in Europe for whom the fund appeals I should like to express deep gratitude to all who have responded", Lord Luke concludes. Then what is wrong with Jews helping fellow-Jews?

Dr. Matthews, the Dean of St. Paul's, in a plea for religious freedom, writes: "The free course of religious life will be grievously hampered if Christians are not able to communicate with one another across the political frontiers. The Church claims to transcend national divisions."

At the same time, as his predecessor, Dean Inge writes:

“The best English Christian will be an Englishman, and as such rather different from the best French Christian.” So too the best English Jew will be and is rather different from the best French Jew. “The British-Jewish type is something distinct from other ‘Jewish types,’” and the *Jewish Chronicle* has editorially accepted its existence and declared that “the British-Jewish type is on the whole not unworthy of its heritage”. Zangwill marked all the different national types of Jews in his *Dreamers in Congress*—Poles and Germans, Swedes and Frenchmen, English and American. “Who speaks of the Jewish type?” he asks. “One can only say that these faces are not Christian.”

J.L.

## CHAPTER EIGHT

### Powerful Jewish Influences

MY DEAR LEFTWICH,

Before dealing with your charges of writing nonsense I would like to express the hope that I have achieved nothing so exquisitely absurd as that last quotation of yours from Zangwill: "Who speaks of the Jewish type? One can only say that these faces are not Christian." It is the first suggestion I have ever heard that a man's precise religious dogma is revealed in his countenance: I must scan the features of my unitarian and agnostic friends to mark in what way they depart from the Christian norm, whatever that may be. If Zangwill had been writing for Arabs he would, presumably, have declared that the Jewish faces were not Moslem faces, and explained for the benefit of the Chinese that they were not Confucian faces, but in Central Africa, among tribes with no religious convictions, it seems that he would have been without any means whatever of differentiating the Jewish physiognomy from that of the grinning blacks around him! Nevertheless—though I cannot but think that, in the instance quoted, it was most ineptly used—there are certain things which do undoubtedly lend themselves to this sort of negative definition, as, for example, in answering your query "What is the English entity?" I find it very difficult indeed to tell you what an Englishman *is*, but very easy to tell you what he *is not*. An Englishman is not a Dane, or a Swede, or a Frenchman, or a Muganda, or an Afghan, or a German, or a Scotsman, or a Welshman, or—with every respect—a Jew. If a Chinaman born in Limehouse were to come to me and say "I am an Englishman" my thought would at once be: "A British subject, perhaps, but an Englishman certainly not." My thought would be

the same were a Jew similarly to represent himself, even though he wore the V.C. riband on his tunic or bore the title of a lord. Your young Jews in the Synagogue are, I am perfectly willing to believe, brave, upright and in every way admirable specimens of manhood who would be a credit to any country: what I cannot grant you, on a matter of pure fact, is that they are Englishmen. Indeed, were they to describe themselves as Englishmen they would be soundly rated by their fellow-Jews. I have read, in the *Jewish Chronicle*, some blistering comments on "Englishmen of the Jewish persuasion". The official Jewish line seems to be that never for a moment should Jews cease to differentiate themselves from other peoples, but that the other peoples ought not to make their own differentiation in the matter. I am afraid, for my own part, that I cannot concur. As the Jews are fully entitled to a Jewish entity to which Englishmen do not belong, so in my view are the English entitled to regard themselves as an entity to which Jews do not belong. This is not to say that I want to murder the Jews, or to lock them up, or to boycott them: what I do want to do is to regard them as the *Jewish Chronicle* regards them—that is, as separate.

Now let me examine in detail some of the assertions in your last two chapters, which for the purpose of conciseness I will summarize under separate headings:

*Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion:* I am not guilty of the equivocation which you insinuate. Insinuation is not my method: I would not write at all unless I could say exactly what I wanted to say. My attitude towards the Protocols is quite clear. I am predisposed to disbelieve their authenticity, and to think that they may well have been invented for purposes of anti-semitic propaganda in Russia. My only doubt about this arose when I saw

ascribed to Dr. Herzl a particularly vicious remark in strict conformity with the Protocol spirit. That is why I mentioned it. A book about anti-semitism should surely deal with all relevant material, however crude, however offensive, however lying. How can one arrive at the truth unless one squarely sets down, not only the central facts, but the facts of what men are saying? I thought that was to be the purpose of our joint effort. Why, then, should you be angry with me for doing precisely what we agreed should be done? The Herzl imputation has been much quoted, and I would have thought you would have been only too pleased for the chance to repudiate it, instead of which you depart from the courtesy I have always associated with you, and sneer at me for having read books with which you seem to be equally familiar. On my shelves are to be found many works on the subject, most of them written by Jews. Indeed, I have read books by Joseph Leftwich. Is this, too, a reflection on "the quality" of my reading? You tell me there is no reference to the matter in Dr. Herzl's diaries, and of course I accept your word, although I should still like to know if a mistake was made by the Jewish periodical which had been quoted, or if the whole incident was a malicious Gentile invention. If the latter, then it was the sort of damnable propaganda lie which I would like to see punished by ten years' penal servitude. Have you access to the *Jewish Chronicle* files?

Having explained my attitude with regard to the authenticity of the Protocols, I must unfortunately go on to incur your further displeasure by expressing my belief that much which they foretold has nevertheless come to pass. How far the various processes have been conscious or unconscious I should not even like to guess, but that a situation has developed similar to that set forth in the forgeries is scarcely open to doubt, as I think you will



agree. The only difference likely to arise between us at this point is that, whereas you will say that the work has been carried out no more by Jews than by anybody else, my own view is that Jews have supplied most of the motive power. Let me make it absolutely plain that I am not accusing Jewry of a deliberate conspiracy to bring about the ruin of Gentile society. I merely say that Gentile society has been put in a fair way to be ruined, and that Jews have been prominently associated with many of the influences which have brought this about. It will be no answer, I respectfully submit, to say that Gentiles have also contributed to the present toxic condition, since it is no part of my argument that they have not. Where you will score—and completely answer me—is in proving that Jews have been equally prominent in supplying anti-toxins, but I think you will find that very difficult. Let me however, give you a helping hand. Is Paul Einzig a Jew? Isidore Ostrer certainly is. Both these men have done valiant work in exposing the iniquities of the money-system, and I honour them for it. Nevertheless you will have something of a job to convince me that Jews are more famous as opponents of that system than they are notorious as its principal operators. And finance, as I hope to show later, is the crux of the whole position.

Your long excursions into the economic opinions of Henry George are not germane to any point that I have brought up. I am not concerned in this book with the validity of theories about the land, as to how the land may best be used for the common benefit of all, but only with the question of motive. Henry George never said to himself: "How can we smash this or that breed of men, or destroy this or that unifying national tradition?" He was interested in the land as such. You may say: "So are the Jews who share his ideas", and of course you may be quite right. But this is the point, Leftwich. How does it come

about that all Jews—with the possible exception of Dizzy, whom you apparently regard as a quaint eccentric, and a very few others—are always on the side of those who seek to break down Britain's national traditions? You may be able to name some well-known Jewish Tories who have acted in the genuine Tory tradition, but they are very, very few and far between. And the Tories—who have been much less the instruments of the capitalist set-up than the Liberals—have had a very good case, however shockingly they may have mishandled it. If Jewish influences had been equally strong in both directions nothing could now be said on the subject, but it is the virtual Jewish unanimity against our continuing traditions which is so disturbing, and which makes Englishmen think that, if there is not a distinctive Jewish game, there is at least a distinctive Jewish dislike of traditional England. You maintain that there is no Jewish game, and once again you may be right. But this much is certain—the century which witnessed the decline of the landed interests was also the century which witnessed the complete emancipation of the Jews in Britain and their astonishing rise to positions of dizzy eminence in every walk of life. It may have been coincidence, of course, but I think not. Here again I am not suggesting a definite conspiracy on the part of any large number of Jews—I think it more likely that they naturally thrive in conditions of flux—but I cannot believe that the mighty Jewish financiers of the period were unaware of what was happening. Since I first broached the subject in this book, incidentally, a work has appeared from the pen of Major C. H. Douglas in which he says:

“During the whole of the nineteenth century we can see the conception of taxation as being a device to finance specific ends, changing into something entirely different—a political weapon, in the main aimed at agriculture but

in general intended to make Finance the Supreme Government."

Finance certainly became the Supreme Government, as I could quote dozens of authorities to prove—including President Wilson and Mr. Lloyd George. If you tell me that Finance in its highest reaches is not mainly a Jewish concern you will be arguing against the whole of history and, indeed, against the accumulated experience of mankind in every country into which the Jews have penetrated. That there have been any number of Gentile imitators and stooges is only too lamentably true, but that does not alter the basic fact that the Jews, as Nietzsche (a pro-Jew) declared, are the "cleverest financiers", or the further fact that large-scale finance, when operating for its own ends, is the greatest pestilence with which a suffering humanity has ever been afflicted.

Incidentally, I admire the ingenuity with which you bring G. K. Chesterton into this controversy of Finance versus the Land as though he were on your side. He was most certainly not, and for your one very ambiguous quotation I could set down many quite definite ones to prove my contention. Do you remember "The Secret People"?

We only know the last sad squires ride slowly towards  
the sea,

And a new people takes the land, and still it is not we.

They have given us into the hands of the new unhappy  
lords,

Lords without honour or anger, who dare not carry  
their swords.

They fight with shuffling papers; they have bright dead  
alien eyes.

They look at our labour and laughter as a tired man  
looks at flies.

And earlier in the same poem:

Our patch of glory has ended, we never heard guns  
again.

But the Squire seemed struck in the saddle; he was  
foolish as if in pain.

He leaned on a staggering lawyer, he clutched a cring-  
ing Jew.

He was stricken; it may be, after all, he was stricken at  
Waterloo.

That was the sense in which I referred to Rothschild as the victor of Waterloo; I was not concerned with the quite unimportant story about his having made money out of the news. After the Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars, Jewish interests blossomed throughout the civilized world, and national traditions decayed.

*International Finance.* You say: "If we have international trade . . . international trade requires an international banker." Does it also involve the enslavement of mankind in a web of unpayable debt? I wonder if you realize the full extent to which the processes of production, distribution and exchange under the international capitalist system have been subordinated to the interests of international finance. Surely, however, you must have had doubts about it when you find that the 'Final Act of Bretton Woods was drawn up long before any conference was held to discuss the future of international trade. A cast-iron monetary policy was formulated, that is to say, before there was any thought of the purposes it would serve, which surely is sufficient indication that the international banker is not a mere intermediary, but the virtual dictator of the economic lives of the nations. For my own part I am a heretic about this international trading business. If conditions were everywhere the same I might be a free trader; as they are not I believe that every nation

should produce to the maximum of what is convenient for it to produce, and to distribute the yield among its own people, trading with other countries only in genuine surpluses, on an *ad valorem* basis. Kemal Ataturk achieved the reconstruction of his country without borrowing a penny from abroad, and although Hitler perverted the German economy for warlike purposes the truth cannot be denied that he built up an enormous production without entangling Germany in international debt. Franco and Salazar hold the same views: indeed if they were not rebels against the international financial system I do not believe there would be any very great outcry against them in the world's press. Against this autarchic concept one finds pretty well the whole of Jewry ranged, first—in my submission—because international finance is to-day almost exclusively Jewish, and secondly because the concept of autarchy implies the concept of national sovereignty, which ought to guard nations against international exploitation and control (though it frequently does not) and which almost all Jews nowadays attack as hostile to their own particular interests. Any amount of Jewish capital goes to the support of international causes: I do not know of a single contemporary Jew who stands four-square for the cause of national Britain. That is my main reason for opposing Jewish influence: I am convinced that, in some cases for financial self-interest, in others for racial self-interest, and in other cases again for purely temperamental reasons, the Jews as a whole—and no matter how much they may differ among themselves—are, in effect, united in the prosecution either of definite policies or of a more indefinite habit of thought which will make it impossible for my country to survive as a Great Power, and it is my view that except as a Great Power she cannot survive at all as an independent entity. Of course I know that there are scores of thousands of indigenious Englishmen, Scotsmen

and Irishmen who are themselves Fifth Columnists in the unpaid service of Internationalism, but while I may hope that it will not prove impossible to demonstrate to them their errors I cannot imagine that it will be possible to persuade a single Jew. For it seems to me that the legitimate interests of Britons and Jews do not coincide in this respect, and I am unregenerate enough to want the interests of Britons to prevail. That they are unlikely to do so after the negotiation of the American loan and the adoption of the Final Act of Bretton Woods does not suggest to me that one should give up the fight, since it is a galling thought that Britain should have emerged victorious from two world wars only to suffer defeat at the hands of a pack of Wall-Street money jugglers. You quote Mr. Morgenthau as wanting an interest-free loan, but surely you must see how immeasurably greater are the issues at stake, and how infinitely more important are the Bretton Woods enactments than the interest on any particular financial transaction. Henceforward the Dollar will control the world, and if Jews do not control the Dollar it will be the most incredible lapse in their history.

*Jew and Gentile Personalities.* Can it really be that you cannot see what I am driving at when I speak of the all-pervading Jewish influence which so inevitably seems to surround Gentile statesmen? Do you really believe that such friendships carry with them no possibility of joint political influence or action? I should hate to think that my own friends were incapable at times of influencing me: why should the great not be similarly influenced by their friends? During the last forty years our leading Statesmen have enjoyed the friendship of some of the most powerful Jews in the world, and I am amazed that you should apparently consider this fact of no significance. You will remember that Mr. Baruch during the last war described himself as "the most important man in

America", and that he regained much of his former influence when the Roosevelt administration began. In 1945 this gentleman, on a visit to Britain, gave an interview to Mr. A. Victor Lasky, in which he was reported to have said: "The reason I am over here is to hold the big stick over the big boys, to make damn sure they are not going to foul up the peace." After the story had been transmitted by the Associated Press to the United States, where it was widely published, Mr. Baruch's secretary stated that it should be withheld from publication. What "big stick" is it that Mr. Baruch held over the "big boys" and who is he that he should have aspired to wield it? As far as I know Mr. Baruch is elected by nobody and is responsible to nobody. Yet he talks as though he exercises a power superior to that of the world's most powerful statesmen, and it would be just too simple-minded to suppose that he talks through his hat. I do wish, Leftwich, that you would bring your own formidable intellect down to earth and really grapple with the implications of incidents such as these.

After reading your scornful dismissal of Disraeli's picture of Jewish influences in the world I happened to pick up *The Times* and read the list of guests at the White House banquet given in 1945 to Mr. Attlee. Here it is, without amendment:

"Among the American guests were Justice Frankfurter, of the Supreme Court; Senators La Follette (Progressive, Wisconsin); Connally (Democrat, Texas) and Warren R. Austin (Republican, Vermont); Mr. Sol Bloom, Democratic Representative from New York and Mr. Charles A. Eaton, Republican Representative from New Jersey; Mr. William Green, President of the American Federation of Labour; Mr. Eric Johnson, President of the United States Chamber of Commerce; Mr. John L. Lewis, head of the United Mine Workers; Mr. Ira Mosher of the National

Association of Manufacturers; Mr. Bernard Baruch; Mr. Herbert B. Swope, journalist and publisher; Mr. Eugene Meyer, editor and publisher of the *Washington Post*; and Mr. Joseph Davies, former United States Ambassador in Moscow.”

You may say that some of the Jews in this group quarrel among themselves, as of course they do, but the fact remains that they are there, right at the top of the tree, exercising immense power out of all proportion to their numbers, and by their presence bearing out the “romantic” concept which Disraeli entertained of them. In Weimar Germany they had the same vast influence, as they had—and still have—in France, Britain, Holland, South Africa, large areas of Latin America, and indeed all over the world. Yet there are said to be only about fifteen million Jews on earth. How comes it that they so infallibly rise to the top, becoming the intimates of statesmen and the universal pullers of strings? You mention Lloyd George as a Gentile not likely to devote himself to Jewish purposes. That man was absolutely surrounded by Jews, with whom he was associated, you will recall, in the little matter of the Marconi shares, and upon the discovery of whom, for quite different reasons, the Zionist Movement never ceased to congratulate itself. Was it a coincidence that President Wilson was also surrounded by Jews? Or that Mr. Churchill and President Roosevelt at a later time were both in the closest contact with Jews of no less power and importance? Must I drag you all over the globe to convince you that what Disraeli painted was not a romantic picture but the literal truth? Or will you accept this phenomenon of a world which is certainly more dominated by Jews, in relation to their tiny members, than by any other distinctive group? If you find it in your heart to make this admission, will you not go further and grant that what Dr. Herzl called “the terrible power of



our purse" may have a good deal to do with all such manifestations of Jewish power? My suggestion, let me hasten to add, is not one of corruption against either Gentile or Jew, but of the financiers' ability to bring "rebellious" Governments crashing to ruin. The statesman who quarrels with them is politically doomed and damned. Unfortunately, your method of meeting an argument of this sort is to pick on some Gentile—such as Cecil Rhodes—and assert that he, too, understood the value of money, which I cannot persuade myself gets us anywhere at all. Who does not know the importance of money? There are, however—as I do not need to explain to you and other non-commercial Jews—still more important values, and it is these which are so directly menaced by the wielders of money-power. If you, the Idealist Leftwich, were living in a Jewish State—say in Zionist Palestine—it seems to me more than likely that you might often be horrified at the outrage offered to your ideals by some purely money-making body operating in that country from New York even though its directors were men of your own race or religion. What I utterly fail to understand is your refusal to allow me similar sentiments towards my own country. If I believed that, in being merged into the new international set-up, England was progressing along a glorious road to the millenium, I would have no fault to find with the way things are moving, and I would doubtless sing the praises of those Jews and Gentiles who are directing their energies to this end. As I do not believe anything of the sort, as I am convinced, on the contrary, that the soul of England is in deadly danger of being submerged, I deplore the influences and agencies which appear to me to be robbing England's posterity of an infinitely precious heritage. If you ask me why I should single out Jewish participation in the present attack on national sovereignty I can only

reply, as before, that I do not despair that my own fellow-countrymen may one day be made aware of the necessity of nationalism, if they are ever again to enjoy a country which is not just an article in pawn to the international money-lending racket, whereas in almost every case I regard the Jew as an unreliable custodian of any national sovereignty other than his own. If I were dealing emotionally with this subject I would express myself a good deal more strongly, since it has not been edifying to observe the attack on British sovereignty by many of those who have found asylum here, and whose response to British hospitality and protection has been a sneer at our traditions, frequently accompanied by a clenched fist.

One last point under this sub-heading. I believe that most Jews, understandably enough, wanted a war to crush Hitler's Germany, and that many of them, especially the most influential actively worked to that end. (Whether or not they would have succeeded if Hitler had not obliged them by his amok-run, is one of those imponderables which scarcely repay speculation.) I believe, moreover, that the influential Jews decided—quite correctly as it happened—that should war come Winston Churchill was the best man on the British side to wage it, and backed him accordingly. Tell me, do you honestly hope to confute this belief with your statement that the Government dropped Belisha? If so, the nonsense in this book is certainly not one-sided. What was the supreme aim of International Jewry? What did it really want? To destroy the German persecutors of their race? Or simply to keep a relatively obscure Jew in his Cabinet post? Really, Leftwich!

*Jewish Internationalism.* You explain Zangwill's reference to the League of Nations as a Jewish concept as indicating no more than the Jew's love of international justice. Do the Jews love international justice more than the English,

or the Scots, or the Danes or the French? I have discovered no evidence that they do. Does such evidence exist? If not, why was the League of Nations a distinctly Jewish concept? In any case, what had the League to do with Justice? I should have thought that it was more concerned with the gold-standard. Perhaps you recall, shortly before the war, the pretty little incident wherein Dr. Weizman was revealed as browbeating the hapless Ormsby-Gore over Palestine, and threatening to make things hot for the British Government at Geneva. What power had the Jewish leader at Geneva superior to that of the mighty British Government? Quite a lot, it would seem. At any rate the Permanent Mandates Commission duly supported the Jewish cause. A Jew, I suppose, would argue that the Jewish claims to Palestine are so undeniable that a body representative of mankind (or such part of it as happened to be affiliated to the League) could not but back them. An Arab—or an Englishman—might see the matter somewhat differently. I am more disposed to think that Dr. Weizman relied on Geneva, not so much because of the soundness of his case, as because he knew he was in a position to pull certain international strings.

Let me, however, deal with your assertion that the Jewish interest in the League of Nations was nothing more than an abstract Jewish love of justice. In his book on the League of Nations, *Geneva Versus Peace* the Comte de Saint-Aulaire, formerly French Ambassador in London, relates that a prominent American Jew attached to the Allied Armistice and Reconstruction Mission in Budapest said to him in the course of a long conversation about Jewish policy in the world: "Our organization for revolution is evidenced by destructive Bolshevism, and for construction by the creation of the League of Nations which is also our work." He then went on, at too great a length to cite, to explain to the Count the internationalizing mission

of Israel as he saw it. The Count also reveals that an outline of a League of Nations, substantially the same as that which ultimately came into being was circulated to the heads of the Allied Governments as early as 1917 by the Congress of Freemasons held in Paris in June of that year. I do not think you will deny that Continental freemasonry is, and has been for nearly two hundred years, notoriously Jew-controlled.

The Count's book, particularly chapters two and three, are full of illuminating illustrations, supported by chapter and verse, of the influence of occult powers behind the scenes in the creation of the League. One more example must suffice. The Association for the League of Free Nations in the United States was directed by Jacob H. Schiff and five other American bankers of Jewish race. The Association was powerful enough to be able by a single cablegram, dated 28th May, 1919, to compel the President to alter his policy completely on the vital issues of reparations, the SAAR, UPPER SILESIA, DANZIG and FIUME. Is it not significant that this powerful Jewish group should have formed the Association to support the formation of a League of Nations? It seems impossible in the face of this one fact alone to deny that *the* League was, in part at least, of Jewish origin.

*The French Revolution.* Space does not permit us any latitude with which to develop our respective arguments on this vast subject. My own views, summarized to the point of unfairness, are that the Revolution destroyed one of the peak periods of European civilization; that it was not sustained by the spontaneous will of the people, who had constantly to be incited; that more than it ever achieved was granted by Louis at the start; that the social amendments required could have been made, as in England, by the mere pressure of events, without recourse to violence; that so far from serving a social purpose it merely

opened the flood-gates to big-scale capitalism, and in this sense reached its apotheosis in the France of Stavisky; that it provided the mechanism whereby fine craftsmen only too often lost their individuality to become part of a proletarian rabble; and that its one certain success was the emergence of Jews to ostentatious wealth and power. I quoted Napoleon to emphasize the last point, and you appear to think that you have provided a suitable rejoinder by quoting another occasion when Napoleon declared that he had no wish to persecute the Jews. That relevance, I fear, as in many of your interesting polemics, utterly escapes me. Then there is the subject of the Queen's necklace. It is now generally agreed, I think, that this was a plot designed to discredit the Throne and further the revolution then being incubated. Do you deny that the Jews had a part in the conspiracy. Was Cagliostro not a Jew? Perhaps he was not, for the scoundrel was wrapped in mystery. His real name was Joseph Balsamo, and he was certainly regarded as a Jew by his contemporaries, his only disclaimer being that he had never been a Jew by religion; he said nothing about race. M. Louis Dasté in *Marie Antoinette et le complot maconnique* cites numerous statements by Cagliostro's contemporaries that he was a Jew by race. Friederich Bulau in *Geheime Geschichten und Rathselhafte Menschen* (Vol. I, p. 311) not only repeats that he was a Jew, but further alleges that it was he who was responsible for introducing Jews into the Masonic lodges.

Mrs. Nesta Webster, who touches upon Cagliostro in three of her books, *World Revolution*, *Secret Societies and Subversive Movements*, and *Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette, Before the Revolution* refers to him in all three as the son of a converted Sicilian Jew, and she rightly points out that no evidence has ever been produced to rebut the almost universal opinion of his contemporaries that the Balsamos

were Jews *by race*, while Cagliostro's own insistence on never having been a Jew *by religion* is at least suggestive, since the ordinary Sicilian peasant would not be likely to be anything but a Catholic. The presence of Jewish influences behind the affair of the necklace, apart from Cagliostro, is beyond question. Of the Cardinal de Rohan, half-dupe, half-accomplice, M. Munier-Jolain writes in *Le Cardinal Collier et Marie Antoinette*, p. 139 (referring to the period just before "the affair") "Henceforth, he surrounded himself with financiers, above all Jews, the Cerf-Beers of Strasbourg, good lenders at a high rate of interest. The Prince of the Church concerned himself with ameliorating the conditions of their race. The rabbis fêted him and attended on him." It is significant that Isaac Cerf-Bear and other Jews found the money to buy the necklace, as well as to pay the debts of the La Mottes (the main engineers of the plot) and to buy the furniture for the house they acquired on setting out on their enterprise. It is scarcely less significant that the La Mottes were introduced to the Cardinal by La Marquise de Boulainvilliers, who was the wife of a Jew, the grandson of the banker Samuel Bernard. After the Cardinal's trial and upon his return to Strasbourg, "the Jews distinguished themselves by their welcome," says M. Munier-Jolain (op. cit. p. 181) "they had always favoured this bishop, he went to their synagogue and thanked them for lighting so many candles in his honour". Finally Nicole Leguay, who impersonated the Queen at the famous interview with the Cardinal, has been described by M. Frantz Funck-Brentano in his *L'Affaire du Collier*, p. 152, as being "in the clutches (entre les pattes) of a Jew named Nathan to whom she owed money".

Behind every one of the principal figures in this hideous plot to ruin a young and innocent woman, and with her a régime, we find the figure of a Jew. "The Affair of the

Necklace", has long been recognized as a masonic plot. Must we not in the light of the above facts, class it as Judaeo-Masonic in origin?

*The Russian Revolution.* If you are sure that Kerensky insisted upon the return to Russia of Trotsky, then that would seem to dispose of the incident. Many American writers assert that it was a "high personage" in the United States who brought influence to bear on the British Government. Whichever explanation is correct, however, the fact remains that American Jewish and German Jewish financiers, with Jewish affiliations in France, were directly concerned with the financing of the Bolshevik Revolution, and it is no less true that Jewish agitators from New York (the counter-part to the men of Marseilles in the French Revolution, though the latter were not Jews) were transhipped to Russia to form the hard core of the uprising. Nor, by mentioning the names of Lenin, Stalin, or—indeed—a hundred other Russians, do you dispose of the fact that the Russian Revolution was predominantly led by Jews. Over ninety per cent. of the first commissars were Jewish, and if there is any doubt on this subject we can publish their names in an appendix. Do you realize where these implications lead? A friend of mine who had travelled (disapprovingly) in Hitler's Germany was recently invited to a rally of Zionist youth in London. Inclined to be pro-Jewish, he was nevertheless profoundly disquieted by what he saw and heard there. "I might have been at a Hitler Youth gathering," he told me. "There was the same fanaticism, the same shining idealism in every eye, the same complete devotion and sense of rectitude, the same intolerance. I could distinguish no difference in spirit whatever between these young Jews and the Nazi youth of the old days." Now I do not look askance at fanaticism for a national cause in the youth of any nation, and I have far more respect for

these Jewish boys and girls than I have for those of my own race who would rather fritter away their time in dance-halls or cinemas. But, unless properly controlled, fanaticism is dangerously explosive, and Jews are no more immune to those dangers than are Germans, or Italians, or Britons, or anybody else. That is a truth for all of us to remember. You will have guessed my point. It is that—until the horrors of the gas-chamber were instituted by a Germany gone beserk in war—the Russian Revolution was the bloodiest, most murderous affair in modern times, and it was carried out by a régime over ninety per cent. of whose commissars were Jews! Jews are mistaken in thinking that they are always the oppressed. It was a Jew (Dr. Oscar Levy, if I am not mistaken) who wrote: "We are the world's greatest persecutors." Shortly afterwards the British authorities deported him to France. His offence—apart from drawing up that terrible indictment against his own people—has never been made known. Can you throw any light on it? I have already quoted another instance of the exercise of Jewish power on the British Government—that which arose out of the Russian Revolution, when the Netherlands Ambassador in Moscow sent out a detailed report of the reign of terror there, and demonstrated beyond all doubt its overwhelmingly Jewish nature. The unsuspecting British Foreign Office, I must repeat issued the document as a White Paper, whereupon some mysterious agency got swiftly to work, with the result that the White Paper was withdrawn and re-issued a day or two later—with all reference to the Jews excised! If this is not a side-light on the reality of Jewish power I don't know what is.

I do not see the connection between my implied reference to the vast political prisons of Siberia and Jewish settlements there, but I gather that on the whole you are moderately well satisfied with the latter. I cannot fail to



note, however, that there is no observable stampede on the part of Western Jews to fight for entrance into that paradise, and that the passion of Eastern Jewish refugees, as in Poland, is at all costs to escape to the West. Life in Russia may be tolerable—and perhaps even ecstatic—for top-ranking Communists and Commissars (of whom, after the Trotskyist purges, appreciably fewer are now Jews), but for the ordinary person, Jew or Gentile, it does not seem to be a particularly happy affair. Yet this Police-State was conceived by Jews and almost entirely founded by Jews, and Jews in all other parts of the world are still among the most vociferous propagandists on its behalf. I cannot think why, unless it be that Bolshevism was once a largely Jewish instrument in Russia, and that hopes are entertained that in other countries no Stalin will arise to convert it from an international to a national basis thus to some considerable extent defeating the designs of its Jewish adherents. It occurs to me that you may reply that the westward flight of the Eastern Jews is to be accounted for by the Russian ban on religion and the Zionist cause. Are these anathemas, however, not lifted? We are told that worship in the Soviet Union is now as free as air, and that Stalin has completely changed his mind about Zionism. The latter announcement, incidentally, roughly coincided with Professor Laski's return to the Zionist fold—which shows at least a marked community of spirit between the latter gentleman and the Soviet authorities!

*Second Exodus.* Your description of the flight of the dispossessed Eastern Jews is indeed harrowing, and I do not doubt that it is an accurate description of many of these unfortunate people. But it does not describe them all, as General Morgan's disclosures made clear. I quote from *The Times* of 3rd January, 1946:

"General Morgan said he had seen an exodus of Jews from Poland in Russian trains on a regular route from

Lodz to Berlin. All of them were well dressed, well fed, healthy, and had 'pockets bulging with money'. All of them, he said, told the same monotonous story of threats, pogroms, and atrocities in Poland as a reason for their leaving. A new factor in the United States zone—the arrival of a whole carload of Jewish children from Rumania and Hungary—added to his belief that a world organization of Jews was being formed. He did not know who was financing the movement or stuffing Jewish pockets with Russian-printed occupation marks. He cited the example of 'a committee of liberated Jews in Bavaria' who formerly wrote to him on scraps of paper and were now writing on the finest engraved stationery. The formation of a 'federation of former inmates of concentration camps' in Germany, he believed, would bring German Jews into the movement."

Subsequently General Morgan denied that the statement of these facts constituted an attack on Jewry, but he did not deny their substance. What happened? In an instant, without waiting for a single investigation, World Jewry was after him like a pack of hounds. "A fantastically untrue allegation" declared the London political secretary of the World Jewish Congress. "Grotesque boggy", declared the Jewish Board of Deputies. New York rabbis, with equal vehemence, delivered themselves of the same verdict. Mr. Walter Winchell, declared that he should be "stripped of his uniform". The British Press with no less promptitude—and no more concern for the production of evidence—sprang into the fray to chide the General and to vindicate the Jews concerned. When the General was completely vindicated there were no apologies.

After crossing the Atlantic to apologize to Mr. Lehman for his "lack of tact", General Morgan continued as the European chief of U.N.R.R.A. until he felt impelled to

make further revelations, whereupon Mr. La Guardia—who had taken Mr. Lehman's place as head of the organization—finally got rid of him. Mr. La Guardia was said to be of Jewish blood, but whether or not that be true there can be no doubt that he was violently pro-Jewish and pro-Zionist. (You may remember the gross discourtesy of his remark about "firing" Mr. Bevin so that he could deal with the Palestine problem.) He promptly replaced General Morgan with a Jew.

Next came the British Government's announcement that the attempted Jewish exodus from Europe—by then an established fact—was actually being provisioned by U.N.R.R.A. Mr. La Guardia, so far from denying it, declared that such supplies would continue. Nor was that the limit of U.N.R.R.A.'s identification with Zionist policy. Former British members of its Greek mission have affirmed that this body, among other things, served as a cover beneath which some of its many Jewish officials were enabled to make frequent journeys, often in R.A.F. planes, to attend conferences in Palestine, all nominally on U.N.R.R.A. duty, and at public expense. These facts, I am informed, can be verified by the Greek and Egyptian Governments. The latter, finding that numbers of highly-placed U.N.R.R.A. Jews were in the habit of using Egypt as a port of call between Athens and Cairo, was obliged to put a stop to it, whereupon visas for Turkey became much in demand. Those of us who wondered why U.N.R.R.A. officials should have sought—and obtained—diplomatic immunity now wonder no more! Still more recently the *Daily Telegraph* reported the suspected use of U.N.R.R.A. camps in Southern Italy as departure-points for would-be illegal immigrants into Palestine. The same thing has happened in France, as the following report from *The Times* of 6th November, 1946 shows:

"The British Government has informally drawn the

attention of the French Government to conditions at the villa of La Ciotat, twenty-five miles east of Marseilles and reported to be an 'escape port' for illegal Jewish immigrants to Palestine. It is stated that a large camp for displaced persons organized by U.N.R.R.A. is near the village and that American lorries supplied to the camp by U.N.R.R.A. had been used to convey Jews to the sea-shore where they were picked up and embarked. The British Government, it is understood, suggested to the French Government that the camp might be moved further from the sea. The French Government have not yet replied."

Whether or not U.N.R.R.A. has discharged its humanitarian role faithfully and well is a matter we need not debate, but what we cannot disregard is the fact that World Jewry has blatantly made use of its vast organization for purposes quite other than those announced to the world. The British tax-payer, second largest contributor to U.N.R.R.A., has thus unknowingly helped to subsidize a vast movement hostile to his own Government's policy; perhaps, in some cases, even to finance the killing of his fellow-countrymen serving in the British forces in Palestine. I wonder if this state of affairs strikes you as being as abominable as it does me.

Unfortunately, however, even now we have not come to the end of this extraordinary business. The Zionists were able, not only to secure declarations of support from the rival candidates for the United States' presidency, but to make use of many elements of the American Army of Occupation in Germany. Jewish emigrants from Eastern Europe were openly conducted through the American Zone, the movement appearing to be controlled by rabbis serving as United States chaplains. General McNarney, American Commander-in-Chief in Germany, in expressing his determination not to countenance further organized entry of Jews into the American Zone, told the special

correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* that his "adviser on Jewish affairs, Rabbi Bernstein, who had visited Poland recently, estimated that about sixty thousand Jews were preparing to leave Poland now, and they might be expected to leave at the rate of twenty thousand a month for the next three months. Another forty thousand Jews were getting ready to leave but would probably stay in Poland through the winter and leave in the spring. After that about eighty thousand Jews would still be left in Poland, and of these about half would probably decide to stay in Poland and the remaining forty thousand would probably try to get out, although perhaps over a fairly long period. No repetition of the long trek of Jews was expected from the Balkan countries," General McNarney went on. "Some were coming out of Hungary, Roumania and Bulgaria, but it was thought likely that the majority of Jews would stay in those countries."

Thus we find that, at one time or other during the great exodus, Zionism, in its attempt to defeat British policy in Palestine, has been able to enlist the support—active or passive—of:

The American Government.

The Russian Government.

The Polish Government.

The Hungarian Government.

The Roumanian Government.

The Bulgarian Government.

The world-wide U.N.R.R.A. organization.

If this is not a demonstration of Jewish power, then what is it to be called? There may be no continuing Jewish plot on the lines of the Protocols of Zion, but you cannot seriously suggest that the organization of so vast a movement, with all that it implies in the way of agreements with many nations, the provision of shipping and a million and one other details, does not proclaim the existence of a

*de facto* secret Jewish Government to-day. If you call it by any other name I will not dispute with you the title.

It would be pleasant if the contemporary plot had no further ramifications, but unfortunately that is not the case. I quote from the *Manchester Guardian*:

“Asked to describe what he meant by ‘organized movements’ of Jews from the British and Soviet Zones, General McNarney gave two examples. The first of these related to the activities in the British Zone of a Jewish brigade attached to the British Army. This brigade, General McNarney said, was naturally equipped with transport, and tactical exercises were arranged which brought lorries to the American zone boundary. These lorries were filled with Jews who wanted to get into the American zone and who, in fact, had got into the American zone in this way. He had brought this to the notice of the British Commander-in-Chief, and it had not happened recently. . . . General McNarney’s references to the part played by Jewish troops attached to the British Army in smuggling Jews into the American zone were confirmed to me by a British authority later to-day. The Jewish troops, concerned, he said, were not a whole Jewish brigade but Jewish units serving in a mixed brigade. They were stationed in Belgium and employed in lines of communication duties. Suspicions were aroused when it was found that some of these Jewish units were indulging in some very peculiar ‘tactical exercises’, involving long journeys at night. It was thought that most of the Jews they had got into the American zone came from Holland, but the Jewish units may have had links with Poland as well.

When their activities were discovered the units concerned were disbanded at the end of May and sent back to Palestine.”

The Jewish Brigade, through no fault of its own, was

formed too late to take much part in the fighting against Germany, but its formation, nevertheless, would seem not to have been entirely futile! It was raised under British auspices, integrated with the British Army, and equipped and maintained by the British tax-payer. Need I say anything more on the subject? The moral seems only too lamentably clear. There is, however, one question I would like to ask you. Is it at all possible that some of the Jews thus engaged in service hostile to the purpose for which they were paid might conceivably have formed part of the Synagogue congregations of soldiers for whom you claimed the name of "Englishmen"?

*Palestine.* I shall have more to say about Palestine in my concluding chapter. Here I can do no more than touch upon one or two of the matters which you have raised. I do not challenge the importance to Britain of the Mediterranean strategy. We managed very nicely without it, and we have managed damned badly with it; the mandate has been one long embarrassment and liability. You imply that we went there for oil. I would contest this, but even if it were true you would still be arguing in a circle, since the dominant "British" oil interests of the period were anything but divorced from Jewish interests. No doubt the Jews will eventually win Palestine. I can only hope that they do not achieve their victory by means of British bayonets. In any event I do not see how a Jewish Palestine will appreciably diminish the Jewish problem anywhere else. You take me up wrongly on the Sir Ronald Storrs incident. I know only too well the diversity of the origins of anti-British feeling in America, but on your own showing that feeling has been exacerbated by Zionist tirades. That Jews loyal to the British administration in Palestine were put in the same pillory as British officers in no way affects my argument, which was designed to show that, over a purely local dispute between Palestinian Jews

and British officials, Jewry had the power, through Press propaganda, of ridiculing us in the eyes of the American public and of adding to the bad blood which was so regrettable a feature of Anglo-American relations throughout the 'twenties. That incident, however, as I shall show in the next chapter has become a very minor one in the light of recent events.

*Dual Loyalties.* You are eloquent on the subject of the loyalty of British Jews to Britain, and, providing the interests of the two go hand-in-hand, I am only too willing to believe that their loyalty is sincere. But what happens when the two sets of interests diverge? Can you assure me that, to oppose Mandatory policy in Palestine, Zionists domiciled in Britain would not go all out to secure the support of Zionists domiciled in the United States, or anywhere else in the world? Have they ever shown the slightest reluctance to do so? On one page you agree that the Jews have not always pursued their objectives in Palestine with an excessive regard for the interests of others, yet on other pages you obviously think it ungenerous of me to make any distinction as between Englishman and Jew. How can I fail to make that distinction when I know very well that if it came to choosing between England and Palestine there is probably not a convinced Zionist in this country who would not count England well lost for the attainment of his enduring dream. Do please understand that in saying this I am not casting any stones. As a nationalist I understand how Zionists feel. There is more to it, however, than the Zionist aspect. Jews can be, and have been, as loyal to England as have Englishmen, but Jews in general—no doubt because of their long history of wandering—do really find it much easier to change nationalities than do the rest of mankind. I know of a Jew who, a few years ago, lived in Germany, and probably called himself a German.



Then he went to Turkey, where he called himself a Turk. At least, on arriving in England he described himself as a Turkish Jew. In England he certainly soon began to call himself an Englishman. Now he lives in the United States, where I feel quite sure that he calls himself an American. Such a case is by no means unique. Have you read Leopold Infeld's very interesting autobiography? Infeld was born an Austrian citizen in what is now Polish territory. He was brought up to respect the Austrian Emperor, but when the 1914 war came he felt no urge to fight in that allegiance. Called to the colours, he arranged for his father to bribe the sergeant who kept the register at the barracks, so that he managed to evade most of his military service. Then came the setting up of the Polish Republic. Infeld regarded himself as a Pole, and felt that it would be dishonourable to use the same method of "dodging the column" now that Poland was again a nation. *So he promptly left for Germany!* Here he was helped by German Jews to pursue his studies, returning to Poland when there was no longer any danger of having to serve for the due period in the Polish Army. Finally he went to America, where he was helped to find scope for his great gifts by Einstein. I found many things to admire in Infeld's life-story, but his concept of loyalty to Poland was not among them! Do you remember how, when the Jewish Brigade was being formed, Colonel Henriques (for whose services to Britain if I may say so, I have the highest regard) ventured the opinion that many Jews preferred to wear the badges of British regiments rather than the Star of David, and was most vehemently attacked by the *Jewish Chronicle* for his temerity? Later, it is true, the *Jewish Chronicle* apologized, but is there no significance in the fact that this official organ of British Jewry was positive, in the first instance, that Jews would be prouder of a Jewish emblem than of a British emblem?

The Colonel's contention, admittedly, bears out your idea of Jewish loyalty to Britain, but I claim that the original attitude of the *Jewish Chronicle* confirms me in my own doubts as to how far it would go in the event of a definite clash of interests. Suppose, for one wild moment, however, that the national interests of Britain had demanded our alliance with Hitler's Germany in the last war! On the loyalty of how many British Jews would we then have been able to bank? Nobody could have blamed them had they deserted our cause *en bloc*, but loyalty is nevertheless loyalty, whether the war on which one's country is embarked earns one's approval or one's detestation.

That is one reason why your comparison between Mandel and Laval seems to me so unsound. I salute Mandel as a brave man, and—except at the moment of his death—I always despised Laval, but with the best will in the world I cannot concede that Mandel's situation presented his conscience with any dilemma. He served what he rightly judged to be the best interests both of France and of Jewry. Wherein lay the conflict between loyalties? In the same way I am bound to add that I have never come across any evidence, before the defeat of his country, that Laval was disloyal to France. Thereafter he accepted the German victory as a *fait accompli* and backed the Germans, whereas de Gaulle did not accept the *fait accompli*, and so continued to back the Western Powers. De Gaulle did not take this course because he wanted France to be dominated by America and Britain, and I find it difficult to believe that Laval backed the Germans because he wanted Germany to remain in possession of France. That is as it may be. I am not called upon to undertake the man's post-mortem defence, but I do try—against the universal pressure of propaganda—to keep my sense of probabilities intact.

There were, as you say, many more British traitors than the half dozen who were all that I knew about when I first wrote to you about them. What of it? Had we been ranged with Germany, instead of against her, would the number of Jewish traitors have been so small? I don't think the British Free Corps ever amounted to more than a few hundred. Would it surprise you to know that if the decision were mine I would have every proved traitor—in peace or war—shot? As it is, some have got off with shockingly light sentences. (Incidentally, I should have thought that the trials of these creatures constituted acts of "British Defence". Why should reports of them have been published in the *Jewish Chronicle* under the heading "Jewish Defence"?) Had the British Islands been conquered I do not doubt that the Germans would not have lacked for collaborators over here, but I am quite sure that they would have been servile wretches and sycophants from all sections of the community and from all parties—Communists, Socialists, Conservatives, Liberals and Fascists. Perhaps some Fascists would have been among the first to come forward. Again, what of it? I am equally sure that very many more Fascists would have been found dead in the trenches, resisting to the last. Do you know that many of them, even after months, and in some cases years of their lives had been spent in imprisonment without trial, served without the slightest bitterness in the Armed Forces, my greatest friend among them? So where do you arrive along that line of argument? If you expect me to excuse treason because of its anti-semitic motive you will be disappointed. I do not see why you should fling at me the acceptance in Britain of Joyce as a man of British nationality. Do you go about demanding to see the birth-certificate of every Jew to make sure that he is what he pretends to be? Before I leave this subject I find it necessary, though with the very greatest reluctance,

to take you up sharply on a personal matter. You express the "hope" that I would have been among the resisters to Hitler. The obvious innuendo is that I might not. You lack the right to make any such suggestion. In the summer of 1940, when invasion was expected I was in command of a defensive position outside one of Britain's seaports. Are you suggesting that, had the Germans arrived, I might have deserted my post and gone over to the enemy? If you did not mean that, what point is there in expressing your "hope" that I might have been a resister to my country's foes? Is the soldier who takes up arms not to be accorded that title? Or is it to be reserved for those who merely figured on Hitler's black-list? In 1941 I was in the spearhead of the British advance into Abyssinia. Was there no resistance in that? Upon my word you surprise me! It is hateful for anybody to speak of his own services, but the limit does really seem to be reached when a man in two wars can give seven and a half years of his life to his country as a volunteer in arms, be decorated by his King for conduct on the battlefield, and yet be met with a pious "hope" that he would have resisted the Germans had they landed in his own country. Since assurances seem to be needed, please allow me to assure you that I not only would have resisted, but did resist. My loyalty is not divided: I own sole allegiance to my King, and I no more wanted my country to be dominated by Germans than I want it to be dominated by Russians, Americans, Turks, Danes, Assyrians—or Jews.

To whom, however, is the loyalty of the Jew due? To the country of his adoption—or to his own people? I would like a firm, precise answer to this question, should you be inclined to furnish one.

There is, in this strange modern world, yet another complication to be discussed before we leave this vexed question. If a Jew is a British citizen, a Zionist and a

Communist all in one, how does he untangle the assorted loyalties inherent in that problem? You have made much—and, as I think, fantastically disproportionate—use of the fact that a handful of Britons betrayed their flag during the war. Have you ever reflected upon what attitude would be taken by many Jews in the event of a war—which Heaven forbid—against Russia? When the Canadian Government, like our own, was rounding up, to detain without trial, categories of men not dissimilar from those arrested over here under 18B, it was spurred on by a certain gentleman called Mr. Fred Rose, M.P., who began life as Rosenberg. In conjunction with a Mr. Sam Carr, born with the less Anglo-Saxon name of Cohen, this virtuous denouncer of innocent men later engaged in activities which you will find fully set forth in the Report on the Royal Commission on espionage, and of the names mentioned therein as having been implicated *over half* are those of Jews or part-Jews. Your answer here is sure to be that Gentiles were also indicted. Agreed! But what of the proportion? Do Jews constitute more than half of the population of Canada? “It is significant”, states the Report, “that a number of the documents from the Russian Embassy specifically note ‘Jew’ or ‘Jewess’ in entries on their relevant Canadian agents or prospective agents, showing that the Russian Fifth Column leaders attached particular significance to this matter.” How do you explain this fact? I think you should, at the same time, explain that the British White Paper of 1919 declared that Russian Bolshevism was organized by foreign Jews.

*Jews and Crime:* What suspicious fellows you Jews are! When I tell you that I have rarely heard of Jews in this country being associated with the darker crimes I am being perfectly honest—I have indeed rarely heard of them. But that I should say anything good about Jews seems to you intolerable, and you at once begin to wonder

whether I am trying to suggest some disparagement—in this case that they lack the guts for violence. Thereupon you rattle off a list of names of Jewish criminals who would belie any such suggestion. I admire the staunchness of your advocacy, but where, O where, is your sense of humour?

*The Talmud.* You say that I “repeat the lie” that the Talmud depicts the Gentile as a hewer of wood and a drawer of water, an inferior creature without rights, to be exploited and despoiled as the Jews desire. I wish you would understand that I am not concerned to repeat any lie, and that if I were I would hardly select lies for the pleasure of seeing you expose them in the next chapter. The author whom you so despise, L. Fry, gives these quotations from the Talmudic book *Shulchan Arak*:

“When a Jew has a Gentile in his clutches, another Jew may go to the same Gentile, lend him money and in his turn deceive him, so that the Gentile shall be ruined. For the property of a Gentile (according to our law) belongs to no one, and the first Jew that passes has the full right to seize it.”

“When a Jew makes a deal with a Gentile, and another Jew comes up and deceives the Gentile no matter in what manner, whether he give him false measure or overcharge him, then both Jews must share between them the profits thus sent by Jehovah.”

“Although it is not a direct obligation for a Jew to kill a Gentile with whom he lives in peace, yet in no case is he allowed to save a Gentile’s life.”

“It is always a meritorious deed to get hold of a Gentile’s possessions.”

“Marriages taking place among Gentiles have no binding strength, i.e. their cohabitation is just as the coupling of horses, therefore their children do not stand as humanly related to their parents.”

Fry then quotes this comment by the Jew Asher Ginzberg: "The Shulchan Arak is not the book that we have chosen for our guide, but the book that has been made our guide, whether we would or not, by force of historical development: because this book, just as it is in its present form, with all its most uncouth sections, was the book that best suited the spirit of our people, their conditions and their needs, in those generations in which they accepted it as binding on themselves and their descendants. If we proclaim that this is not our law we shall be proclaiming a falsehood."

If you are able to give me your solemn assurance that the passages quoted do not occur in the book in question, and that Ginzberg's comment thereon is a fabrication, then of course you win this particular argument with flying colours. But you do not establish your case by merely accusing me of "repeating a lie". In any event my interest in the matter is confined to finding a cause for those financial and commercial habits which have been universally associated with Jewry, which is also why I introduced Mundak's statement about the Jew who could cheat and yet feel clean. I feel sure that there is some tie-up between these things, but you do not seem to be willing to look for it. You prefer to talk about my "mad accusations", regardless of the fact that the same "accusations" have been levied against Jews in every age and every clime. If you say that they do not really represent the experience of mankind, but are merely the malicious inventions of anti-semites endlessly repeated, I can only express my opinion that such a concept puts the Protocols of Zion in the shade!

A. K. C.

## Popular Anti-Semitism

MY DEAR LEFTWICH,

Popular anti-semitism, of course, has its beginning in propinquity. Most human beings love to live among their own kind, and as far as possible according to their own immemorial traditions. That explains Whitechapel and North London, where many more Jews are found than elsewhere in that great city. It explains every foreign colony everywhere. Is it surprising, therefore, that many Englishmen should have the same preference! If Jews like to congregate in Golders Green, why should it be considered intolerable if Englishmen declare that there are places where they themselves would like to congregate? What happens in the process of the creation of anti-semitism is something like this:—English people (or Frenchmen, or Danes, or Germans, or Turks) are living contentedly in a locality when the first Jewish family arrives to take up residence. It is received without ill-will. This family, however, attracts other Jewish families, and soon the atmosphere of the neighbourhood undergoes a change. There is a different physiognomy in the streets. The local institutions are patronized by Jews and at once lose something of their character. Because of their greater assertiveness the Jews in some cases often take over the actual running of the institutions. They also, perhaps, stand for election to the local council, and in course of time are duly elected. The English people, in their own land and locality, begin to feel like strangers. They resent the alteration of the characteristic atmosphere of the place which they once regarded as their own. In her book, *Pack and Follow*, Mrs. Jay Packer, who I am sure is no anti-semitic propagandist, describes this feeling



as it arose in the people of her own district of Cape Town:

“When my parents bought Tees Lodge the neighbourhood was sparsely built up, and from the side stoep it was possible to see out across the bay, and then one day a little further down our street (optimistically named Hope Street) there came into being a glaring white edifice. This was the Zionist Hall, and Mother and Daddy looked at one another and said: ‘It is the beginning of the end.’ They never spoke a truer word. The chimneys of the newcomers reared their heads and peered over the creeper-covered walls, and at their back-doors the Lipshitzes, Oblowitzes and Bernsteins haggled over the price of a bit of kabeljou or a basket of strawberries. And quite soon a deputation of Jewish gentlemen came to my parents and intimated a desire to buy Tees Lodge and convert it into a synagogue.”

It is extraordinary that imaginative Jews should seem to be incapable of appreciating the quality of that kind of emotion.

The next step is taken when the Jews become local landlords, for it is a fact that in this capacity—though always with honourable exceptions—they tend to be pretty generally hated. At the same time they open up their shops and businesses, and compete with their Gentile rivals by methods which often earn—rightly or wrongly—an equal detestation. The third phase begins when many of the Jews, mightily prosperous, walk about the streets with an insufferable air of proprietorship. All the ingredients of local anti-semitism are now assembled, but it is only when the more perspicacious Gentiles, looking over the broader national field, discover that a somewhat similar process of infiltration has been going on in many other parts, and that Jews have captured a great deal of national and international power, that anything

in the nature of an anti-semitic movement is likely to come into being. It must be insisted, however, that propinquity is the basis of the entire Jewish Problem so far as the average Englishman is concerned. Before the war there was no mass anti-semitism anywhere except where there was a mass Jewish population to create it: Englishmen in the County towns and the countryside, knowing few Jews, refused to take the slightest interest in the question. This is no longer true, for anti-semitism has since spread throughout the country and become equally strong in the Armed Forces. The reason was not propaganda—during the war there was no propaganda—but simply the diffusion over the country, as evacuees, of the Jews themselves. The complaints from all parts have been monotonously the same—Jews wangling to live in luxury-flats, their resourcefulness in always getting the “plums”, the aggressive conduct of Jewish women in the queues, their bribery of counterhands to secure special favours, and so on. It is not for me to say whether or not these complaints were justified: I only know that they have been made, and that their substance is of the stuff of anti-semitism. Anti-semitism, in other words, is purely a reaction. The “onlie begetter” of anti-semitism, as my friend Collin Brooks has declared is—Semites. I sincerely believe that if the Jewish leadership would recognize the truth of this assertion we should come appreciably nearer to a remedy.

This, however, is what they will not do. You yourself refuse to do it. When you point, here or there, to the bad conduct of Jews you do so in the manner of a broad-minded man making an admission, but without in any way directly relating it to anti-semitism, which is what we are discussing. You prefer to speak of the “nonsense” I am supposed to have written, to talk about my “mad accusations”, to exaggerate or distort my arguments, or

even to invent for me ideas which have never in my life entered my head. Thus I am supposed to hold the belief that all the evil in the world derives from the Jews, which not only have I not said, but which I have been at some pains to disown. You also imply that I imagine every Jew in the political parties to have been "deliberately" placed therein, which is a ludicrous suggestion. You seem to like it that way, and no small part of the tragedy seems to be that Jewry as a whole likes it that way. The principle, apparently is: "Depict the critic of the Jews as a maniac and hope for the best. Do not analyse anti-semitism—attack it with whatever may lie to your hand."

This general attitude is succinctly summed-up in your observation that in a whipping matter the onus is on the whipper to stop. It indicates a dangerously subjective approach to the problem. If a boy were being constantly chastised by one school-master and not by others there might be good cause for an inquiry into that man's attitude towards that particular child, but should it be found that the same pupil had met with the same treatment from all masters in a world-wide diversity of schools and—if the metaphor may be stretched so far—in almost every age, then it seems to me pretty plain that the investigation should begin with an enquiry into the psychology, not of the masters, but of the boy himself. Jewry may prefer to think that it lives in a world of problem-children, but I submit that it would be wiser to consider the possibility that, if it is not itself the problem child, at least it appears in that light to the generality of mankind, which in effect amounts to the same thing. I suppose it is natural that Jews should be reluctant to accept this view. It is so much less painful to lay the blame for the hostility one arouses in the world upon the shoulders of others; accounting for it in the envy and spleen of one's critics. But such an attitude, however human and understandable, does

nothing to alleviate the trouble. It only makes things worse.

I believe, too, that every step taken by the Jews in their own defence, temporarily successful though it often is, tends in the long run to increase the hostility displayed towards them. First there is the clamorous demand of a certain kind of Jew—I would say, with reservations, of Jews as a whole—for complete and absolute acceptance by the peoples among whom they settle; a partial acceptance, it seems, is no good to them. An exclusive race themselves, they are outraged by the tendency to exclusiveness in others, and use their whole might to break down the barriers which it erects. This urge even possesses them when they are excluded from a purely social club. I know a city, wherein every club was open to Jews except one. Instead of respecting the preference of the members of that one club, the Jews went all out to break into it, and eventually, by various devices, they succeeded and were duly elated. They did not realize what their success cost—the transforming of several hundred Englishmen, who until then had manifested nothing more hostile than a desire to consort with their own kind, into bitter critics of Jewry. Incidentally, most of them at once formed another club, so that all the gate-crashers really succeeded in doing was to cause a great deal of inconvenience and fuss. The average Englishman scorns to go where he is not wanted, but certain types of Jews reveal a thicker skin. It will be no reply to say that you yourself have never wanted to gate-crash: we are discussing anti-semitism. Fortunately there is no anti-Leftwichism for us to discuss!

Then there is the immediate reaction of the Jews to the displeasure that their activities arouse: their vehement insistence that the displeasing traits attributed to them are not distinctively Jewish; and their counter-attack, attributing to Gentiles analogous characteristics. A rather

pathetic instance of this, I thought, was your recital of Gentile names associated with arson. Considering all the thousands of millions of them who have at one time or another lived on the earth it would indeed be strange if none had ever set anything alight. Surely you must see how weak is this particular line of argument. It is a fact that several insurance-companies, profit-making concerns only too anxious to do business, have refused, nevertheless, to accept risks of certain kinds—including fire-risks—from Jews. It is a fact that the universal funny story is about Ikey and his fire, and that John Bull and his fire, or Uncle Sam and his fire, or Johnny Frenchman and his fire, would simply lack point. Why not admit it, and consider what can be done about it, instead of denying what any East End policeman before the war could have told you was the truth?

Finally comes Jewry's organized resistance to the anti-semitism which it has itself engendered. This is a virulent process which creates fresh anti-semitism at every turn. Let a well-intentioned preacher on the radio (as recently happened) go nine-tenths of the way with Jewry, and then branch off for the remaining tenth of the journey, and the Jewish Board of Deputies will spring instantly into the fray to make its protests. Let an editor sympathetic to Jewry (like the editor of *Picture Post*) publish in his open forum even a mildly critical letter about the Jews, and the Deputies at once swing round to bay at his heels. "Verboten!" You say Jewry does not control the Press. I assert that, in all matters affecting its own interests, Jewry exerts over almost the entire Press of this country very considerable control. It has advertising leverage of such power that it does not need to own the various papers. During the war a weekly journal in North-west Lancashire, being short of news, decided one week to "feature" the report of a speech by a local councillor in

which he referred to the financial activities of World Jewry. I think I am right in saying that, as a penalty for fulfilling its function—that is, of reporting a piece of news—the paper suffered the loss of every single Jewish advertiser. If you wish to check up on this I will send you details. I am unable to disclose some private information in my possession about Lord Rothermere's dropping of the Blackshirts, but I do not think you will deny the significance of the fact that, on the day the announcement was made, both the *Daily Mail* and the *Evening News* appeared with leading articles full of the most fulsome praise of Jewry. The same thing happens in America. The South African *Jewish Times* of 30th November, 1945, prints a cable from its New York correspondent which begins:

“Indignation against John O'Donnell's *New York Daily News* column alleging Jewish conspiracy to secure General Patton's dismissal has taken a more concrete form than protests and letters to the editor. Three New York department stores have withdrawn their advertisements; there is also a noticeable fall in circulation. An appeal to the Jews of New York to organize mass protests of readers and advertisers was issued by Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, in his capacity as President of the American Jewish Congress.” Even if, in the face of such evidence, you still contend that Jews do not control the Press, are you prepared to deny that they make an astonishingly good attempt at so doing? The boycott is a foul weapon, as Jewry is ready enough to complain when it is directed against Jews, but it uses the same weapon much more relentlessly when that happens to suit its turn.

American Jewry also successfully manages to bring pressure to bear upon American publishers. If British publishers were similarly to offend them, I have no doubt that the Board of Deputies would soon give an example of its persuasive powers in that direction as well. Perhaps we

should congratulate ourselves, however, that over here our rulers are still allowed to refer to us as a Christian nation. If the President of the United States inadvertently applies the same description to the people of America there is at once a terrific howl of protest from the Jews. Moreover, it is still possible for the "Merchant of Venice" to be performed in Britain, whereas in many American States Jewry has managed to get the play outlawed! I do not know to what further extent British Jews will succeed in preventing Britons speaking their own minds in their own country, but one observes that they are now in full cry to secure special legislation against their critics. When that happens, and should the law be made retro-active, I imagine that the honest opinions I have stated in this book will land me in jail.

At this point I must—although with reluctance—deal with the latest process for the manufacture of anti-semitism—the process of terrorism. You condemn it, I know, and so does every decent Jew, but the recent outbreaks in Palestine and elsewhere cannot on that account be dismissed as the work of any small and despised minority. I hope to be able to show why.

First, however, let me give, very briefly, the picture of the Palestine problem which I—and probably most Britons—see in the mind's eye. Possession, in the international sphere, is not only nine-tenths of the law, but the whole law. And there can be no doubt that in 1919 the Arabs, with only small racial minorities, were solidly in possession of Palestine. The Jewish claim had lapsed during an alienation lasting more than thirteen centuries, which is a very long time in history. In fact there is no valid Jewish claim except that advanced by sentiment and romanticism, so that the progress which Jewry has made in securing recognition of so infinitely slender a right is a great tribute to Jewish power and racial fervour. There is

no point in discussing the diverse interpretations placed upon the Balfour Declaration, since that would be to argue in circles, and in any case the Declaration itself rests on no legality, but on *force majeure*, exerted first in the defeat of Turkey, and thereafter in quelling Arab "rebellions" by British arms. Whether or not the Declaration was ethical, it accorded but ill with a Peace Treaty professedly designed to make secure the reality of "self-determination". At any rate the Jewish National Home, in the face of bitter Arab opposition, came to be built in Palestine under the auspices of those who are now called "British Nazis". Blow, blow, thou winter wind! Needless to say the National Home has not satisfied the Zionists, who can scarcely conceal the fact that what they want—and what all along they have wanted—is a National State. They hoped that the Second World War would give them that State: it certainly gave many of them the opportunity to acquire a plentiful supply of modern weapons and ammunition, with the result that British fighting-men, having played a major part in liberating Jewry from the clutches of its worst enemy, have had to defend their own lives against the cowardly assaults of those whom they have so greatly benefited.

It is argued, of course, that the terrorists are only small gangs, in no way representative of Palestinian Jewry, but that is a hypothesis difficult to sustain. If it were true that the overwhelming majority of Jews in the country abhorred the atrocities, why have they not stamped them out? The fact that very few Jews in Palestine have been hanged since the murder campaign began, would suggest that the terrorists received ample protection from the main body of their co-racials. Indeed, Hagana—the supposedly reputable Jewish organization—made this explicit in a recent broadcast, when it asserted that, while it would deal with terrorism in its own (unspecified) way, it would not



denounce or hand over the terrorists to the "White Paper Government". Since the mandatory authority is the only legal authority, Hagana thus proclaimed to the world that it would not co-operate with the forces of law and order. If it possessed knowledge of the terrorists which it refused to divulge, then clearly it must be regarded as accessory before and after the fact of murder.

Propaganda of a kind calculated to bolster up—and, to ignorant minds, justify—terrorism, has been appearing in many parts of the world. I quote from *Truth* of 8th March, 1946:

"In a recent issue of the *New York Times* is an advertisement of no fewer than five full-length columns. At the top is a cartoon depicting a group of vicious-faced soldiers, armed with a super-abundance of modern weapons, dragging in heavy chains a bewildered young boy captive, while in the background tanks and battleships lend their formidable support to the operation. Who are these 'plug-uglies' in uniform? German S.S.? Italian Fascisti? Russian guards in Siberia? No—they are abominable travesties of British troops. Their innocent victim is an illegal Jewish immigrant into Palestine. In charge of affairs is shown a contemptible, monocled British officer of the American music-hall type, and on his despatch-case are the British Royal Arms and motto. *Honi soit*, indeed! Such is how the situation of illegal immigrants occurs to the American League for a Free Palestine, which must have considerable funds to be able on this lavish scale to libel the British Government, Army and people in the eyes of the American public."

In November, 1946 the *Daily Express* published this pretty little quotation:

"'Cyprus—A study in British Honour', says a full-page advertisement in to-day's New York newspapers. It is published by the Metropolitan Zionist Fund of Greater

New York, Inc., and says: "The U.S. must put an end to Britain's war against the Jews. How long will Washington remain silent while Britain carries on where Hitler left off?"

Nor does the campaign of racial libel stop short of our own shores. A paper published in Britain called *Jewish Struggle*, not long ago brought out a bold banner headline which ran "YOU ARE THE MURDERERS". The "you", as far as one could gather, referred to the British people. In the same issue was a cartoon which depicted famished Jews being pressed against gas-chambers by men of the Sixth Airborne Division!

All this virulent hatred is being directed against the British nation because its Government is trying to preserve the balance and to be fair to Arabs as well as to Jews. What is to be pleaded in extenuation of such vile, defamatory stuff? It will be interesting to hear what you have to say on the subject.

You may reply that the responsible Jewry deplores it as much as it deplores the actual terrorism in Palestine which it accompanies, and certainly I have read in the *Jewish Chronicle* some noble denunciations of that terrorism. The effect, however, is marred when I also read in that journal paragraphs such as this :

"An impressive mock trial organized by Blackpool Young Zionists at the Jewish Circle Club and Youth Centre, King Street, revealed the 'circumstances' that led up to the killing by a Palestinian Jewish youth of a British officer.

There were revelations of life in Poland, escape from pogroms to a free life in Palestine, and the death of parents, with many others, when a ship with its load of human misery, was forbidden by this same officer to land its unhappy passengers.

Actually, one witness was himself a refugee from Ger-

many, another, born in Palestine and taken to Germany as a tiny girl came to Blackpool as a refugee in 1939, while the 'prisoner' is in charge of a hostel for refugees in Blackpool, under Bachad, and is actively preparing himself and others for a life in Palestine.

The 'jury' returned a unanimous verdict of 'not guilty' of murder."

You will observe:

(a) That the *Jewish Chronicle* was "impressed" by a debate which decided that the killing of a British officer while engaged on official duties was not murder, and

(b) That refugees who were granted shelter here from persecution elsewhere had no reluctance in taking part in the nauseating proceedings.

The *Jewish Chronicle*, moreover, while denouncing the terrorism, has conducted, week after week, a "smear" campaign against the British troops and police in Palestine charging them with almost every known offence from the gravest to the most ludicrous—among the latter being an allegation that they lined some Jews against a wall and made them chant "The British, they are good". Can you imagine anything more grotesquely out of keeping with the British character? The British soldier, wherever he goes, has been called "Britain's finest ambassador". Mr. J. B. Priestley describes his conduct in Berlin as "shining like a jewel". That has been the universal experience of Tommy Atkins. It is left to Jewry to defame him! Jews affect to be surprised that as a result of what has happened in Palestine our men should have become anti-semitic. What on earth was to have been expected? As the *Yorkshire Post* has said, "British troops have never had a task calling for greater restraint and tact. They may defend themselves only when attacked, and field operations are outside their scope of action." In other words, they must wait, before taking action, until they are shot at,

mined or blown up by miscreants who rarely offer their own bodies as a target. That there have been isolated "incidents" is natural enough—the best discipline in the world will sometimes snap if subjected to an intolerable strain—but there is no doubt whatever that in Palestine, as everywhere else, our troops have behaved with wonderful patience and do not deserve the bestial vilification to which Jews have subjected them. If they return home out of love with Jewry, however, it will not be their fault, or the fault of any anti-semitism in Britain.

What is the excuse for this "war"—whether conducted by bombs or by propaganda—against the nation to which Jewry owes so much? Some argue that the terrorists include men made desperate by their experiences in German concentration camps, but one would have thought that Britain's part in securing their release from those hellish places might have been more gratefully recognized than by dynamite and defamation. Others say that the opening of Palestine has become a matter of crucial urgency because of pogroms in Poland. Do you believe that there have been such pogroms? I don't. The evidence for them is so slender as to be almost non-existent. Incidents no doubt occur from time to time in a country which has long witnessed the mutual hatred of Gentile and Jew, but not on a scale to justify the exodus of tens of thousands of people who have been described as well-fed, well-clothed, prosperous and arrogant. World Jewry does not allow its people to be persecuted without hitting back. There was an immense hitting back at Tsarist Russia and at Hitler's Germany. Why not at post-war Poland and Stalin's Russia? Obviously, because these two countries and Zionist headquarters have come to a mutually satisfactory arrangement.

No, the only excuse for the violent anti-British campaign now being conducted is that it is a means of enforcing a

claim to Palestine which is thirteen hundred years out of date. I wonder, even should the final objective be won, if the anti-semitism engendered during the process will not more than counter-balance the gains. The British people are good-tempered and slow to take offence, but there is a limit to what they will endure. There may even be a limit to the caution of British members of Parliament who at present take care not to say in public what nine Britons out of every ten are saying in pubs and clubs and private houses throughout the land.

You tell me that my view of the Jewish question is the "wrong shape". I do not agree with you. It may be in parts distorted or exaggerated, for that is liable to happen to us all, but fundamentally wrong—no. If that view were as you have presented it, then of course you would be on firm ground. But it is not. The Talmud interests me scarcely at all, the Protocols still less. I do not think there is an occult conspiracy on the part of the Jewish leadership, handed down from one generation to another. Even if there were, I would not imagine that anybody was privy to it outside a very small circle. I do not regard the Jews the world over as a phalanx, moving automatically to some hidden command; what I do believe is that certain Jews in all countries tend to rise to the top and occupy positions of great influence or authority; that largely because of their racial affiliations these Jews form close business—and sometimes political—contacts with each other and so exert great international influence on affairs; that this influence in the main is devoted to the furthering of financial interests which certainly do not always accord with the interests of national economies, and to the furthering of political interests which do not necessarily serve the interests of world peace and justice; that within each nation the Jewish influence tends to the destruction of national consciousness and tradition; that it gives a

foreign slant to national life, cheapens it and finally, unless checked, changes it out of recognition; and—finally—that the Jews as a whole, and always with large numbers of exceptions, have the unhappy knack of making themselves detested wherever they go. If the holding of these beliefs is the mark of a madman, then I am prepared to be accounted mad. If their utterance is a mark of criminality, then I am prepared to go to jail.

If disinterested Jews would only investigate how such beliefs come to be held and sustained, instead of devoting the whole of their effort to an investigation of how they may be discredited, then an important part of the battle would surely be won. I write this with all the more conviction because of my suspicion that the hopes and fears and ideals of ordinary Jews are very often played upon by some Jewish leaders for ends that may be remote from those which the Jews suppose. At any rate there is no doubt in my mind that the course I suggest would be a healthier process than the stupid vilification and victimization of anti-semites. Merely to blame Hitler, or the Tsar, or any body of anti-semites anywhere, is to refuse to learn from history. And the whole of history, Leftwich, is against you. How many Jews (or Englishmen) know for instance, that the Jewish Problem forms part of a clause embodied in Magna Carta? I quote from the official translation:

“If any one shall have borrowed money from the Jews, more or less and die before the debt be satisfied, no interest shall be taken upon such debt so long as the heir be under age, of whomsoever he may hold; And if the debt shall fall into Our hands, We will only take the chattel mentioned in the Charter. And if any one die indebted to the Jews his wife shall have her dower and pay nothing of that debt; And if the children of the said deceased be left under age they shall have necessaries

provided for them according to the condition of the deceased and the debt shall be paid out of the residue, saving the lord's service; and so shall it be done with regard to debts owed to other persons than Jews."

Seventy-five years later (in 1290) there was issued the Statute of Jewry, which is sufficiently interesting to quote in full, not only because it shows the extent of the problem even at that time but even more because it reveals the kindly and distinctive approach of the English to such matters:

*Usury forbidden to the Jews.*

Forasmuch as the King hath seen that divers evils and the disinheriting of the good men of his land have happened by the usuries which the Jews have made in time past, and that divers sins have followed thereupon; albeit he and his ancestors have received much benefit from the Jewish people in all times past; nevertheless for the honour of God and the common benefit of the people, the king hath ordained and established, that from henceforth no Jew shall lend anything at usury either upon land, or upon rent or upon other thing:

And that no usuries shall run in time coming from the feast of Saint Edward last past. Notwithstanding the covenants before made shall be observed, saving that the usuries shall cease. But all those who owe debt to Jews upon pledges of moveables shall acquit them between this and Easter; if not they shall be forfeited. And if any Jew shall lend at usury contrary to this ordinance, the King will not lend his aid, neither by himself

or his officers for the recovering of his loan: but will punish him at his discretion for the offence and will do justice to the Christian that he may obtain his pledge again.

*Distress for Debts to Jews.*

And that the distress for debts due unto the Jews from henceforth shall not be so grievous but that the moiety of lands and chattels of the Christians shall remain for their maintenance; and that no distress shall be made for a Jewry debt, upon the heir of the debtor named in the Jews deed, nor upon any other person holding the land that was the debtors before that the debt be put in suit and allowed in court.

*Valuing of lands taken for a Jew debt.*

And if the sheriff or other bailiff by the Kings Command hath to give Seisin (possession) to a Jew, be it one or more, for their debt, of chattels or land to the value of the debt, the chattels shall be valued by the oaths of good men and be delivered to the Jew or Jews or to their proxy to the amount of the debt; and if the chattels be not sufficient, the lands shall be extended by the same oath before the delivery of seisin to the Jew or Jews, to each in his due proportion; so that it may be certainly known that the debt is quit and the Christian may have his land again; saving always to the Christian the moiety of his land and chattels for his maintenance as aforesaid; and the chief mansion.

*Warranty to Jews.*

And if any moveables hereafter be found in possession of a Jew and any man shall sue



him, the Jew shall be allowed his warranty if he may have it; and if not, let him answer therefore so that he be not herein otherwise privileged than a Christian.

*Abode of  
Jews.*

And that all Jews shall dwell in the Kings own cities and boroughs where the chests of Chirographs of Jews are wont to be:

*Their  
Badge.*

And that each Jew after he shall be seven years old, shall wear a badge on his outer garment that is to say in the form of two tables joined, of yellow felt of the length of six inches and of the breadth of three inches.

*Their Tax.*

And that each one, after he shall be twelve years old, pay three pence yearly at Easter of tax to the King whose bond-man he is; and this shall hold place as well for a woman as a man.

*Conveyance  
of land, etc.  
by Jews.*

And that no Jew shall have the power to infeoff (to take possession of) another whether Jew or Christian, of houses, rent or tenements that he now hath, nor to alien in any other manner nor to make acquittance to any Christian of his debt without the especial licence of the King, until the King shall have otherwise ordained therein.

*Privileges of  
the Jews.*

And forasmuch as it is the will and sufferance of Holy Church, that they may live and be preserved, the King taketh them under his protection and granteth them his peace; and willeth that they be safely preserved and

defended by his sheriffs and other bailiffs and by his liege men; and commandeth that none shall do them harm or damage or wrong in their bodies or in their goods, moveable or immoveable; and they shall neither plead nor be impleaded in any court nor be challenged or troubled in any court except in the court of the King whose bondmen they are; and that none shall owe obedience, or service or rent except to the King or his bailiffs in his name unless it be for their dwellings which they now hold by paying rent; saving the right of Holy Church.

*Intercourse  
between  
Jews and  
Christians.*

And the King granteth unto them that they may gain their living by lawful merchandise and their labour, and that they may have intercourse with Christians in order to carry on lawful trade by selling and buying. But that no Christian, for this cause or any other shall dwell among them. And the King willeth that they shall not by reason of their merchandise be put to lot and scot nor in taxes with the men of the cities or boroughs where they abide; for that they are taxable to the King as his bondmen and to none other but the King.

*Holding  
houses and  
Farms, etc.*

Moreover the King granteth unto them that they may buy houses and cartilages in the cities and boroughs where they abide, so that they hold them in chief of the King; saving unto the lords of the fee their services due and accustomed. And that they may take and buy farms or land for the term of ten years or

less without taking homages or fealties or such sort of obedience from Christians and without having advowsons of churches and that they may be able to gain their living in the world, if they have not the means of trading or cannot labour; and this licence to take lands to farm shall endure to them for fifteen years from this time forward.

Apart from the law that the Jews should proclaim themselves in their dress—which at that time would have been a less noxious requirement than if promulgated to-day—there is nothing in the statute to which the unoffending Jew could possibly take exception, yet it seems clear that its repeal in 1845 was a result of pressure by all sections of the Jewish community. Mark the King's concern about "the disinheriting of the good men of his land" and ask yourself how many good men have been disinherited during the last hundred years! It would be an over-simplification to say that this has directly resulted from the repeal of the Statute (which had become largely inoperative during the previous 150 years), but the process by which it has been achieved is much the same as that which Edward I forbade. The system, operated as it may be to-day by Gentiles as well as Jews, nevertheless remains an essentially Jewish system and has been identified as such since Babylonian times.

You tell me that you yourself know very little about finance, but since this is the only real problem of the modern age, dominating both politics and economics, don't you think it would be a good thing to learn about it? I would recommend you to read, patiently and without bias, *The Mystical Body of Christ and the Reorganization of Society*, by the Rev. Denis Fahey, (The Forum Press, Cork). It gives a complete account of the general finan-

cial attack on society which I have tried, though only very briefly, to indicate. You are not asked to accept everything in the book, but after reading the second half of it I am sure you will understand much that at present seems to be hidden from you.

Our own book has limits, so let me now briefly list a few suggestions as to the line of approach which might be helpful in dealing with this appalling tragedy of anti-semitism.

1. Jews should face the fact that they, and only they, are the creators of anti-semitism.

2. They should study the history of their impact on Gentile society, endeavouring to modify causes rather than to stamp out effects.

3. They should remember, in England, that if they continue to show less tolerance than the English they must inevitably provoke intolerance, and thus widen the field for anti-semitism.

4. They should make up their minds whether their loyalty is due to Britain or to their own racial entity. To argue that the two loyalties are inevitably one and the same is absurd.

5. Those who proclaim their loyalty to Britain should dissociate themselves from all political activities on behalf of Jewry elsewhere.

6. These loyalist Jews should still remember that, by their refusal of absorption, they form a separate and identifiable section of the community, and that they are therefore liable to create anti-semitism should they become conspicuous in movements' subversive of national traditions and the national way of life. Conversely they must be careful not to assume the custodianship of those traditions, since to a virile people that is even more insufferable. Reflect for a moment, on the *Jewish Chronicle's* homily to the Jewish M.P.'s elected in 1945: "They will do well to have

always in mind that the soundest guarantee of their loyal and conscientious devotion to the State can be assured only by an unwavering individual loyalty to the ideals of Judaism on which the glory of Britain has been built!" Admirable in intention no doubt, but in phrasing how exceedingly tactless! You will complain that I am placing Jewry between the Devil and the deep blue sea, but unfortunately, so long as they retain their separate identity, that is exactly how they *are* placed, and they will not alter the fact by aspiring themselves to become both the deep sea and the Devil! In brief, the less Jews have to do with our politics the less likely are they to arouse our resentment.

7. Those Jews whose loyalty is above all to their own racial entity, if they remain here, should remain as aliens, deportable to their country of origin should the need arise.

Since Palestine, in any case, is not big enough to solve the Jewish Problem, or even greatly to alleviate it, why do we not all turn our minds to a consideration of other areas of the earth's surface? Mussolini once ventured the opinion that, if the Mediterranean could be let into the Sahara, living room could be found for thriving communities totalling a hundred million people. Is this a madman's dream? I do not know, but the scientists of the atomic-age ought to be able to tell us. If the Sahara cannot be made to blossom like the rose, are there places elsewhere which can? Surely this would be a more creative way of trying to deal with Jewish homelessness than is the present furore about Palestine, which, dear though it be to the Jewish heart, does not affect the real question.

8. Meanwhile, is it impossible for the Jews, on this and every other subject, to pipe down a little? They are "giving us too much of themselves". Cock-a-hoop though most of them are at the present time, they should really be told that their general popularity among us is not such as

to warrant the loud and unnecessary din they make upon our ears. We have passed through two shattering wars and we are very tired. Besides this, we have appalling problems of our own to solve. Can Jewry not respect our need, which is for peace? We have welcomed them to these islands and so long as their conduct here sufficiently conforms to our own standards and traditions there is no reason why they should not stay. But for Heaven's sake let them relax. Let them discover the uses of a sense of proportion, even of a sense of humour. The hideous persecutions to which they have been subjected elsewhere must be constantly in their minds, I agree, but it is as well to remember that those persecutions did not occur because they kept quiet, but for quite the opposite reason.

9. If the Jews want to be politically active, let them study the financial question and then fight the International Money-Power, which is the basic factor in the whole modern complex and which has control over every existing political party. In doing this they would be largely fighting their own people—men and groups who exert a decisive power over world affairs. That would not be easy, but if disinterested Jewry were to engage and overcome the financial enemy they would more than redeem their race from the dark reproach brought upon it by all the centuries of merciless Jewish usury. Then, indeed, could begin an era of real co-operation between Christian and Jew.

10. Finally, let the Jews frankly recognize that the separate identity which they claim for themselves (but which they upbraid Gentiles for taking into account) does create special difficulties, and so learn to be patient and understanding about them. By denying any English entity which does not embrace them, for instance, they offer an affront that is none the less real because for the time being Englishmen are too doped and bewildered by

propaganda to do anything about it. We may not always be governed by political dwarfs. If one day a great enough Englishman should arise to call for public support in the task of preserving England against Jewish inroads, that support will be forthcoming in overwhelming degree—not to persecute the Jews (which would be alien to the English temperament) but perhaps to re-enact in modern form the Statute of Jewry. The only permanent way the Jews can obviate any such development is to remember that, whatever their services may have been, and altogether apart from considerations as to whether or not their situation is just or unjust, they remain guests in our land, and should act accordingly. Mr. Collin Brooks, in a *Truth* article, stressed this point when he wrote: "Anti-semitism is not a sign of treachery or moral delinquency in those who exhibit it, but a cold, inescapable criticism of the race which has aroused it. A normal Englishman, Scotsman, Welshman, Canadian, South African would say: 'If we give the hospitality and shelter of our land to this unfortunate and homeless race, noble as so many of its members are, pitiable as all are in their landlessness, surely they should comport themselves like guests and not try to wrest from us either by luck or cunning the control of our affairs, whether political, social or industrial. This is our land, these are our traditions, and we do not wish to be orientalized. Let the Jew take shelter here from the persecutions and afflictions which have injured him elsewhere, but let him remember that he is still a tolerated guest, and let him not be the usurper of that place and power which for the spiritual health of our own race should be occupied by men of our own breed and past.' "

I did say that my heart went out to you when you expressed your desire for more Jewishness, but I went on to give the reason, which you have suppressed. It is that I want for my own people exactly the same thing—more

Englishness. I allow you your Jewishness, and I allow it to you in the land of my own fathers. You will not allow me my Englishness, it seems, ("What is the English entity?" you have asked in scorn) and you will not allow it to me in a land which, presumably, is not of your own fathers. That is the real issue between us. But if this book gets reviewed, I bet you that you will figure as the noble defender of a persecuted race, while it will be I who am called the intolerant bigot! It will not make me any the less tolerant towards your Jewishness, but neither will it make me any the less convinced that at the present time, and for long past, it is my own English people who are really oppressed and persecuted. Study world finance, Leftwich, and let us unite to fight it.

A. K. C.



## Just Balances, Just Weights

MY DEAR CHESTERTON,

Zangwill may be absurd, but Emerson had the same idea. "Each religious sect has its physiognomy," he wrote. "The Methodists have acquired a face; the Quakers a face; the nuns a face. An Englishman will pick out a dissenter by his manners." So you might try scanning the features of your Unitarian and agnostic friends. Zangwill did not say that Jews do not look different. He said that there was no Jewish face common to Polish, Russian, Swedish, French, German, English, American or Turkish Jews. I saw a German Jew this week who looks like the English caricature of a typical German. "Who speaks of the Jewish type?" Zangwill asked. "One can only say that these faces are not Christian." Of course, Jews are not Christians. And the way a man lives makes a change in his appearance. Mr. Basil Henriques, who is regarded as the representative Jewish assimilationist, told the Anglo-American Enquiry Commission that "we are extremely keen on the distinctiveness of the Jew in contrast to the separation of the Jew. We do not want to see anything resembling religious assimilation." And he suggested that one of the causes of anti-semitism in Germany was "perhaps that this religious distinction had been rather lost sight of by those who had wanted to be identified as Germans. They thought less about their religion. That is one thing we don't want to do," he said.

No doubt Zangwill would have said that the faces of the Arab Jews in Yemen are not Moslem faces. The black Falasha Jews in Abyssinia do not look altogether like the equally black Abyssinian Christians. I don't know how many generations of intermarriage would produce from a

Limehouse Chinaman an Englishman you would recognize as such. I have seen a good many English people with traces of Mongolian admixture. Just as I have seen Jews who show traces of Tartar descent. But European Jews are not Chinese. At the same Enquiry Commission I heard General Spears, who gave anti-Zionist testimony say that "the average Jewish immigrant (in Palestine) is a simple *European*", which was the reason that "his ways were very different from even well-educated Arabs of a similar position in life". Though there was, he said, "the indigenous Jew who has got the same outlook on life as his Arab neighbour." General Spears declared his belief that "the ordinary modern European Jew is descended from Tartar and Hittite tribes, and was converted to the Jewish faith in the eighth or ninth century", and went on to quote Sir John Hope Simpson that "the immigrants from Eastern Europe can in no sense be said to be 'returning' to a home land. They have in them not one drop of Hebrew blood, but are descended from pagan Mongol and Slav ancestors who were converted to Judaism many centuries ago." He further quoted Professor Driver of Oxford, who said, "The blood of the Jews of the Dispersion was far from being purely Hebrew. It had been replenished not only by intermarriage, but by the admission of countless individual proselytes and even whole tribes."

Incidentally, "Scrutator" reminds us in writing of Egyptian nationalism that in Egypt the Christian finds himself as a non-Moslem in the same plight as a Jew in Christian England. "A Copt will not count because he is a Christian, though his blood is pure Egyptian and his ancestors embraced Christianity before Mohammed was born."

The Bishop of Worcester writes to *The Times* to complain that in Egypt "the Christian and Jewish minorities feel that the scales are weighted against them. Article 149

of the Egyptian Constitution says 'Islam is the religion of the State'. The policy of discrimination against Christian and Jew is defended by Muslim leaders who quote Article 149. In raising these points", the Bishop explains, just as I would, "I am not advocating any special rights for Christians or Jews in virtue of their religion, but only their civil rights as citizens."

Julian Huxley is quite sure that the Jews are not a "race". "What they have preserved and transmitted is not 'racial qualities,'" he says, "but religious and social traditions." "What community of fate and national cohesion can there be between the Georgian, Daghestanian, Russian and American Jews, who are completely separated from each other, inhabit different territories and speak different languages? If there is anything common to them left it is their religion, their common origin and certain relics of national character", Stalin has written.

All so-called "national" groups, including the English, are such mixtures. And if I asked, "What is the English entity", and I did not ask it "in scorn", as you say, for I consider myself part of it, I meant to question your "racial" definition of it, which would, as you seek to do, bar me from it. Emerson speaks of the "English composite character". Dean Inge points out the "many snags there are in an attempted estimate of the English genius. Is there such a thing as national character?" he asks. "It may make a great difference whether our public policy, which helps to create an impression of our ways of thinking and acting, is directed by our aristocracy, or our middle class, or by organized labour. Again, if there is a national character, has it remained unchanged? There may be alterations even in the predominant racial type of a mixed population."

I have asked you if the Jew is excluded from the English entity because it is Christian. And I have told you that if

this principle is enforced, then I must be excluded. But what, unhappily, is the state of Christianity in this country to-day? "To-day we confront a new phenomenon—a generation that has lost God. Half our countrymen are worse than heathens in that they believe in nothing—not even in themselves", the Bishop of Rochester said at the Church Assembly.

You speak of the Jews still allowing "our rulers to refer to us as a Christian nation". I seem to have seen objections to this practice made not by Jews, but by very distinguished, "Rationalists", who were not of Jewish origin. In the 1946 *Rationalist Annual* Mr. A. Gowans Whyte has an article on "The Twilight of the Church", in which he discusses the Report of the Church Assembly at which the Bishop of Rochester made his declaration about "heathen England", and he concludes: "The Humanists who are so bitterly denounced in the Report will rejoice that here is signal proof that the emancipation of the mind from obscurantism and superstition has made and is still making genuine progress." There is another article in the same issue by Mr. A. D. Howell Smith on "Rationalism and the Younger Generation". "The traditional religions are certainly losing the grip on the present generation they held on their fathers," he writes. "Many a young man of my own generation, though fewer young women, who had been reared in Catholic, Protestant or Jewish families, revolted against parental creeds, as is the way of the spirited young. But since then an increasing number of young people have grown up with no ideas, or only the vaguest ideas of what their ancestors believed, for their parents were Agnostics or indifferentists."

"Study world finance, Leftwich," you say, "and let us unite to fight it." If you want to preserve English traditions and the English entity fight against this religious indifferentism, this heathenism, Chesterton. "An ungodly

man diggeth up evil." And "the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom."

I am not minimizing the "power of the purse", but why blame me for Bernard Baruch and others who have never heard of me and whom I have never seen. Mr. Bernard Baruch's "big stick" is quite obviously America's big stick, not Jewry's. The phrase has been used by other American politicians, who are not Jews. It was not Bernard Baruch, for instance, but Senator Richard Russell, of Georgia, who forecast the break-up of the British Empire and urged England to become the Forty-ninth State in the U.S.A. Incidentally, I do not know of any "Jewish" activities or interests of Mr. Bernard Baruch's. The American Jewish organizations and papers complain that he takes no part in Jewish life or Jewish affairs. As for what he did in formulating the Baruch plan for atomic control, he is clearly concerned with the interests of his own America, and the Soviet delegates in opposing him recognize it. To them he is, as the *Moscow New Times* says in an attack on his whole plan, "Mr. Bernard Baruch, American representative on the U.N. Commission for Atomic Energy Control".

Why is the "power of the purse" to be considered something purely and solely Jewish? "The power of the purse" is a phrase used in British politics by men like John Bright, not about Jews. I find such a moderate statesman as Lord Grey of Fallodon using it in the same way. And Lloyd George, when he was Chancellor of the Exchequer, saying of Britain: "We are the bankers of the world. We are the merchants of the world. Our business in this country is pre-eminently an international business." More recently an American journalist has been writing: "American money is of course a pervading political power", and his Americans are Dawes, Dewey and J. P. Morgan. I did not bring in Henry George to discuss his economic opinions, but to indicate that rapacious mil-

lionaires need not be Jews, as you seem to think. I can understand fighting the lot, Jews or Christians, Parsees or atheists, but it is not a Jewish issue.

Here I should say a word about your quotation of something Herzl called "the terrible power of our purse". I don't think Herzl knew much about finance. I know that he died completely impoverished, and a public collection had to be made for his children. He used the phrase you quote about the Jewish millionaires, the Rothschilds, Baron de Hirsch, the Schiffs and others, whose money, he thought, could have enabled him to carry out his plan of removing the Jewish problem from Europe. He never succeeded in winning them. He spoke of organizing the middle-class Jews, to create a "second formidable money-power to fight the Rothschilds". He founded for that purpose the Jewish Colonial Trust, whose paid up capital in 1936 was £395,239. "If it leads to a split between the 'big' moneyed Jews and ourselves", he wrote, "there will be a few moneybags and their flunkys on that side, and all the noble, courageous intelligent forces of our people on our side." He never broke through "that wall", as he called it. Zangwill had the same experience. "Lord Rothschild was deaf," he said. "Then there was Jacob Schiff. He was deaf. I tried to talk to him—to talk Zionism to him. But he was deaf. In Paris there is Baron Edmond de Rothschild. He too is deaf."

G. K. Chesterton said a good deal in his time about Jews and anti-semitism. Here is something he said about anti-semites: "There is one thing that amazes me, and that is the confusion that exists among them as to the grounds of their attacks on Jews. One section accuses them of aiming at international control of capital, another at the international annihilation of capital. Now the Jews cannot be capitalists and Bolsheviks at the same time. The fact is they are neither. A few Jewish financiers

and a few Jewish Bolsheviks have exaggerated their own importance by plenty of 'limelight' and publicity. I am not sure whether this particular assertion has rendered the Jews much good service. Speaking of European anti-semitism I should say that my Christian instinct is all against that; it bears hardly on Jews as well as Gentiles. As an individual Christian I say it is not decent."

You take me back to the French Revolution. "It is the only great European movement in which Jews had absolutely no influence, direct or indirect, owing to their inappreciable numbers and insecure positions in the chief centres, Paris, Lyons and Marseilles", writes Joseph Jacobs, in his *Jewish Contributions to Civilization*. "They were influenced by it, not it by them." I see that you call in Mrs. Webster, to argue the contrary. Lucien Wolf has written about her "pet theory of the Jewish authorship of the French Revolution." "It is very largely based on untenable propositions", he declares. "Indeed, whether for good or evil, not a single Jewish name figures conspicuously in the history of the Revolution." You refer to Marie Antoinette as "a young and innocent woman". I know that Carlyle speaks of her "quick noble instincts". But H. G. Wells, who is not carried away by "Jewish propaganda", calls her "a silly and extravagant woman". And Chambers Biographical Dictionary, edited by William Geddie and J. Liddell Geddie, speaks of "her extravagant and undisguised love for the card table, and her open favour to handsome and profligate young men". "Here perhaps is the place to fix, a little more precisely," says Carlyle, "what these two words 'French Revolution' shall mean. French Revolution means the open violent Rebellion and Victory of imprisoned Anarchy against corrupt, worn-out Authority. For as Hierarchies and Dynasties of all kinds, Theocracies, Aristocracies, Autocracies, Strumpetocracies, have ruled over the world, so it

was appointed in the Decrees of Providence, that this same Victorious Anarchy, Jacobinism, Sansculottism, French Revolution, Horrors of French Revolution, or what else mortals name it, should have its turn." Where are the Jews in this?

You repeat that the Russian Revolution was "predominantly led by Jews", and that "over ninety per cent, of the first commissars were Jewish". I did not just "mention" Lenin and Stalin. I said that they two and Trotsky after them (because he arrived later) made the Soviet Revolution, (not the Russian Revolution, which was made before them, by Prince Yussupov, Miliukov, Kerensky and others, and by the growing feeling of the people and the army). Lucien Wolf, in a book published in 1921, writes: "We have heard a great deal of 'Jewish Commissars', and I find a notorious German book quoting Mr. Robert Wilton of *The Times* as its authority for the statement that 'of 384 People's Commissars who constitute the Government only thirteen are Russians, while 300 are Jews'. What are the facts? The only officials in Soviet Russia who are authorized to hold the rank of People's Commissars are the members of the Cabinet. These number seventeen, and of them sixteen are indisputably Gentiles, while only one—Trotsky—is of Jewish birth. And Trotsky is a Jew who has publicly adjured the Jewish and all other religions. The other so-called Jewish Commissars are all men of the second and lower ranks of officials belonging either to the Civil Service or the Soviet analogue of our municipal life. In what may be called the second rank they do not number more than ten at the outside. As the result of a careful analysis M. Poliakoff gives their names as follows: Zinoviev, Radek, Sverdloff, Stekloff, Litvinov, Larine, Kameneff, Ganetzki, Joffe and Cunitzky. Of these two are dead and one is only a half Jew. All this is not to say that there are no professing Jews in the Bolshevik



ranks, or that the number of indifferent and apostate Jews who have thrown in their lot with the Soviets is quite negligible. What is contended is that at the beginning of the Revolution relatively very few Jews—even of those who are Jews by race only—rallied to the call of Lenin.”

I have the 1929 list of members of the Soviet Government. The only “Jewish” name is that of Litvinov, who was Assistant Commissar for Foreign Affairs under Chicherin. There are to-day two Jewish Commissars, Lazar Kaganovitch, Minister for Transport and Simon Ginsberg, Minister of Reconstruction.

You seem to think that Communists and Zionists are in alliance for “Jewish” ends. Friendship between the Soviet Union, the United States and the British Empire is necessary to preserve the peace of the world, and under very trying conditions British policy is directed towards smoothing out the difficulties. None of us should add to those difficulties. Particularly when it is agreed that “the German belief for a new rise of Germany is in the potential profit for them out of conflict between Britain and America with Russia”. But adherence to Communism is a very different matter. Let me quote an authoritative Jewish publication in America, *The Contemporary Jewish Record*, which says in the course of an article called “Communist Propaganda for Jews”, “Since its inception the Communist Party has made strenuous efforts to win members among Jews (in America). Jewish hatred of Nazism furnished the Communists with additional appeals. The New York State Communist Party felt its work among Jews important enough to establish a special Jewish Bureau. The anti-Nazi line was kept in the forefront. The united front appeal among Jews met with very little success. Organizations which were engaged in activities vital to Jewish needs rejected the overtures of the Communists and their affiliates for so-called joint action.

Neither could the Communist Party itself boast a large Jewish membership. This is not the place to summarize Jewish objections to Communism, but the very activities of all Jewish organizations are anti-Communist in their nature." And from Palestine, the *Soviet News* reported in 1945: "Some obviously inspired reactionary organs of the Jewish Press have taken up a hostile attitude towards the Soviet citizens who wish to return home, and are circulating anti-Soviet lies." Zionists have denied these charges, but the accusation was made.

There is no "observable stampede on the part of Western Jews to fight for entrance into that paradise", Chesterton, because the mass of Western Jews are not Communists, and also because the Soviet Union is a self-contained State, which neither admits immigrants nor permits its nationals, Jews and others, to emigrate. Many of the uprooted Jewish victims of Nazism now fleeing westward would no doubt be glad to go to the Soviet Union or to the Jewish settlements in Siberia if they could enter. But I did not think when I opposed the flourishing settlements in Siberia to your vast Siberian "political prisons" (it was the Czarist Government which made Siberia a prison camp, and it was mostly Christians, among them men like Dostoievsky, who found their way to it) that you would conclude that Siberia had only Jewish settlements. I spoke about the big towns which have grown up there. Siberia is to-day a great industrial region, with a population of which Jews constitute only a very small proportion. A recent report says that "towards the end of the war Siberia, as an industrial area, compared favourably with Leningrad and the Leningrad region—and Leningrad's industrial output is second only to Moscow's. The Petrovsk and Zabaikalsk iron and steel works compare in size and equipment with the best iron and steel works in Europe."

I have not heard that the ban on Zionism in the Soviet Union has been lifted. It is said that religious worship is free. But not only for Jews. It is free for Christians and Moslems as well, and not only are there many times more Christians but also many times more Moslems in the Soviet Union than there are Jews. "No, the Church cannot complain about the authorities", I read in a book called *The Truth About Religion in Russia*, published by the Moscow Patriarchate. The Russian Patriarch Nikolai visited England in 1945, and the Archbishop of York who arranged for that visit when he was in Russia, declared on his return that "the Russian Church enjoys a freedom today which it has not had for centuries". In January, 1946, some of the leading Moslem dignitaries in the Soviet Union were received in Moscow by the President of the Council for Religious Affairs in the Soviet Government, on their return from pilgrimage to Mecca.

I know of course about the reports to which you refer in connection with General Sir Frederick Morgan's Statement. There was an outcry, not only by Jews. But it was a Jew, Mr. Herbert Lehman, the head of U.N.R.R.A., who reinstated him, and declared that he had confidence in him; and if you will read the Jewish Press you will find that there was by no means a unanimous "Jewish outcry" against him. I know that several prominent Jews here and in America insisted that General Morgan had meant well, and that no one better qualified for the position could be found. I can give you several names. I shall content myself with one, Mr. Jacob Trobe, Director in Germany of the Jewish Joint Distribution Committee of America, who said: "I believe that Sir Frederick was honest in what he said. I believe the statement was not malicious and therefore believe it would be unfortunate if he were asked to leave his post. I must say that I am one of the more fortunate who have met the General and do not have to

go by what I read in the Press." I keep telling you that there is no such thing as "the Jews", who speak with one voice.

It should interest you that when General Morgan raised an outcry against himself by what he said about "Jewish activities", and there was a Jew at the head of U.N.N.R.A., he remained. But when he started another outcry against himself, this time by what he said about "Soviet activities", and Mr. La Guardia, not a Jew, had succeeded Mr. Lehman as head of U.N.R.R.A., General Morgan was dismissed.

Since then General Morgan has become the advocate-in-chief of the D.P's, urging that 250,000 of them should be admitted to Britain. "Since coming back to England", he says, "I have found an impression that these D.P's are a collection of feckless, workshy, human riff-raff. Nothing could be further from the truth. Through many sensational reports of the misdemeanours of a small minority of these people they have achieved newspaper notoriety to the detriment of the vast patient bulk of them. They are human beings", he says, "and have a right to be treated as such." They are not all Jews, of course, but he includes the Jews in his demand. "They would gladly volunteer," he declares, "to begin new lives in England. They would learn English and acclimatize themselves to the English way of life. Most particularly did this apply to the Jewish D.P.'s, for it was inconceivable that they should be expected to stay on a scene of their decimation, among the people who had butchered their relatives."

So that General Morgan is hardly of your way of thinking. But what are the facts about the organized Jewish exodus in Europe? Long before General Morgan spoke of it I had heard the same story from a Polish Jew who holds a Government position in Poland and who wants Jews to stay in his country. There is no doubt about

the organized character of the exodus. But there is a real impulse behind it. Sir Herbert Emerson, the Director of the Inter-Governmental Committee on Refugees, was asked about it when he appeared before the Anglo-American Enquiry Commission, and he said: "The answer seems quite obvious. There are people who proclaim quite definitely that it is their very strong conviction that Palestine is the right place for their community, and I think it is unreasonable to expect that they would not be propagating their creed." And "unless conditions are made tolerable for them to stay in Poland with assurances of life and liberty, a large proportion will join in this mass migration."

I don't think any revelations of the extent of the Jewish exodus from Europe can add to this explanation. Dr. Joseph Schwartz, the European Director of the Jewish Joint Distribution Committee of America, which does a lot of relief work in Europe, has stated that the Jews who remain in Poland find it increasingly difficult to rehabilitate themselves because of the "rampant anti-semitism". "The continuing migration of at least one-sixth of Europe's one and a half million surviving Jews is complicating the administration of relief," he declares. "We are helping to relieve hardships and suffering for the people in flight, by supplying food, clothing and medical care to those in transit," he explains, "but the Joint Distribution Committee has in no sense 'organized' migration anywhere."

I should add the statement by the then War Minister, Mr. Bellenger, about the charge made against the Jewish Brigade: "I have made careful enquiries, but can find no evidence that the Jewish Brigade has been transporting Jews from the British to the U.S. Zone en route for Palestine."

Judge Rifkind, who was Jewish adviser to the U.S. Command in Europe, has in connection with this very

question of the Jewish D.P.'s, reported: "In the entire area of Europe that I have mentioned I have found not a single Jewish home that has been spared. The extinction of so large a number of Jews has all but destroyed the family as the basic social unit. Europe, and particularly Central and Eastern Europe, is for them a graveyard of memories."

I keep stressing the all-human, not merely the Jewish aspect of the problem. Therefore I want to emphasize that General Morgan is speaking not only of the Jewish D.P.'s when he says: "They are unwilling to return to their old homes with things there as they are." There was a news item in *The Times* about a non-Jewish Dutch author who had at the time of the invasion of Holland got away to London and worked for the Allies. "The end of the war brought him great grief", said *The Times*, "for he had learnt that five of his seven children had been deported to Poland. They did not return. He went back to Holland to his two surviving children, but often visited England to get away from what had become to him a land of painful memory."

To my mind the idea of an exodus of all Jews from Poland and from Europe is unreal. But people are not going to stay to be martyred for the sake of my particular way of thinking about their affairs. Yet, "not all the Jews of Poland are planning to leave", writes a Jewish Telegraphic Agency correspondent in Warsaw, quoted in the *Zionist Review*. "It is not a question of economic security and certainly not a question of an unfriendly Government," he explains. "It is simply the fear that to-day or to-morrow the innate anti-semitism of so many of the Polish people may break out in a violent form." Meanwhile I find that a Zionist leader, Mr. Meer Grossman, the head of the Zionist Revisionist Organization, has written: "The mass exodus of the Jews from Poland has virtually

come to an end. There are several reasons for the ebb. First, internal conditions in Poland have become stabilized, and anti-semitic violence is on the wane."

But I repeat that the exodus feeling is not confined to Jews. The Catholic Council for Polish Welfare appeals for help for half a million Catholic Poles in Western Europe, "survivors of the horrors of the concentration camps, who prefer living in exile rather than go to Poland in present circumstances."

The *Sunday Times* Representative in Prague who described the "widespread longing to emigrate to some part of the world where they would be able to work in peace and plan a living for the future," was writing not of Jews, but of the whole "dissatisfied youth of the country". He found the same bitter sense of hopelessness, insecurity, unrest among the whole population of Austria, Poland and most of Eastern and Southern Europe. The D.P. problem of people who refuse to go back to their countries is not a problem only of Jews.

Nor is the organized exodus of Jews from Europe a new thing. It went on all through the war. It was part of the underground movement against the Germans. Free French, Free Belgians, Free Norwegians, Free Dutch, all used the same methods. I have several detailed reports about these underground illegal emigration movements. "In many cases people did manage to reach the frontier and enter Switzerland," says one of these reports. "But often the venture miscarried, and the poor wretches fell into the hands of the Gestapo. Many strayed in the woods. Many, many non-Jews paid with their lives for the help they had given to a Jew." They fought together in the partisan groups. The technique of the exodus was perfected in the resistance organizations. And with it goes the mentality of the partisans, of the saboteurs, the wreckers and the gunmen, who cannot shake off their war training.

Only then it brought them praise, and to-day it brings them condemnation. It is the same spirit that when they stood up to the Germans in the Battle of the Warsaw Ghetto won them from General Bor, the Polish Commander, the description "heroic". "I can only speak with the greatest admiration of the fighters of the Ghetto revolt," he said. "Their spirit was unconquerable." It is the tragedy of Europe that the war mind persists among all its people amid what we call peace.

"In Naples an Italian soldier went aboard our ship. 'We hate Mussolini for his fatal mistakes', he said. 'We hate Germany for her brutality. We hate Russia for spreading Communism in Europe. We hate France for maltreating our prisoners of war. We hate Britain for thwarting our future. We hate America for her greed.' Someone interrupted: 'Perhaps you will tell us whom you don't hate.' He made no reply, but his silent and expressive scorn revealed the malaise of Europe."

I am not a one-sided witness, and I don't try to hide anything, because it may spoil my case. For I have no case, except this—that Jews are human beings like others, no better, no worse. In 1941, at a P.E.N. Congress in London, I said that no Jew could be a Quisling. "Not for any virtue of the Jews," I explained. "They are rigidly kept outside." I have since found that there were also Jewish Quislings, whom the Germans did not disdain to use. Even there Jews had their black sheep like all others. I have heard of them in Poland, in Belgium, in Holland. They were "collaborators". The Germans, I read, "were playing one section of Jews against the other. The 'privileged' were allowed to remain alive a little longer." I have a paper in front of me in which a Jewish journalist tells the story of what he calls "Jewish traitors in Roumania".

And there were Jewish brutes, as bad as any Nazis. I quote from a Jewish Telegraphic Agency report from



Brussels, dated 8th May, 1946. "The verdict in the trial of twenty-three guards at the Breendouck concentration camp at Antwerp, one of the lesser-known Nazi hells, was announced here yesterday. Among the guards are three Jews, Walter Obler, of Berlin, Leo Schmandt, of Berlin, and Sally Lewin, of Wingrowice, Poland. Obler and Lewin have been sentenced to death, and Schmandt to fifteen years imprisonment."

Louis Golding no doubt had some fact to go upon when he introduced in his book *Elsie Silver* Yacki Kahn, the "Nazi stooge-in-chief" in the Warsaw Ghetto. "There was nothing of the graft and corruption of the various Warsaw undergrounds that Yacki Kahn did not know. He was a Jew, and it was chiefly among Jews that he wielded his knotted flail of terror." What does it prove? That the human beast is found everywhere, and that Jews are no more immune than any other human group.

I am no apologist for Jews and I am not going to hide the fact that the extermination of millions of Jews has left behind a kind of Jew who was tough enough and rough enough to survive. The Joint Distribution Committee of America and the Jewish Health Organization Ose are important and responsible Jewish bodies. And the report of the Joint-Ose medical team which went to Belsen immediately after liberation says: "It is evident that among the victims of the Nazi persecution the best and purest spirits broke down in the terrible struggle for life provoked by the conditions of existence in the concentration camps."

As you are so worried about Jews in relation to Communism, I want to quote something else which Sir Herbert Emerson said about that aspect when he appeared before the Anglo-American Enquiry Commission. He was speaking of the Jews in Poland feeling "distrust and dislike of the political régime. What I meant was this," he explained, "Jews are mainly individualist, they are enter-

prizing, efficient, progressive, and a good number of them, I think, do not like a system of Communism. Some are Communists, but there are many who are not."

I think you have your whole answer here. About everything you can say of the Jews, it is true that "some are, but there are many who are not". As with any other group of people. All these things of which you complain as Jewish traits are not common to all Jews, but are common to all people of a particular temperament and character and outlook. Burke when he thundered against the system set up by the French Revolution, "to form a new commonwealth in each country, upon the basis of the French 'Rights of Men'," said, as people say now of the system set up in the Soviet Union, that "this system has very many partisans in every country in Europe, but particularly in England, where they are already formed into a body, comprehending most of the dissenters of the three leading denominations; to these are readily aggregated all who are dissenters in character, temper and disposition, though not belonging to any of their congregations—that is, all the restless people who resemble them, of all ranks and all parties—Whigs and even Tories—the whole race of half-bred speculators; all the Atheists, Deists and Socinians; all those who hate the clergy and envy the nobility; a good many among the monied people; the East Indians almost to a man, who cannot bear to find that their present importance does not bear a proportion to their wealth." As I have told you before, Chesterton, it is a human problem, not a Jewish problem. The divisions cut through Jews and non-Jews alike. "Exterminate the Jew from capitalist society", says Middleton Murry, "and finance-capital remains: the dirty work of the 'Sheeny' is done by the Aryan instead."

I have heard your story about Dr. Oscar Levy, to whom I referred in my first chapter, but he didn't seem to think

that his deportation was arranged by "the exercise of Jewish power on the British Government", because he made "that terrible indictment against his own people". Do you know his books? He attacked Jews, Germans and English alike. "You English will be attacked as well as the Germans in this book of mine", he wrote. He was a Nietzschean who despised them all. "There was little to choose", he said, "between the plebs of Judaism and Christianity, and of the Elect People few only were elect enough to speculate on good and evil. Like other peoples the Jews never sided with their great men, but thwarted them to the utmost of their power. Nietzsche might have said: 'Above and below but rabble in view; to-day all's one, be it Christian or Jew.'

"Happiness, marriage, family, calm, contentment and comfort were the desires of all peoples, the Jews included", Dr. Levy concluded. His anger with the Jews as persecutors was not because they persecuted others, but because they persecuted their own great men, and he was in this instance concerned with the excommunication of Spinoza, "the first to abandon the decrepit house of his faith and to lay the foundations for an edifice sublimer, more beautiful and joyous, for the kingly home of Nietzsche's philosophy."

Dr. Oscar Levy who came back to England and died at Oxford, contributed quite recently a number of letters to the *Jewish Chronicle* which did not suggest that he bore Jews any resentment for personal persecution. In one of these letters he denied the Nazis the right to claim "Nietzsche's authority for the support of their terrible faith. If Hitler has a right to refer to Nietzsche", he said, "we Jews of the present day lose one of our ablest defenders."

I assure you Chesterton that it was not because it is "intolerable" to me that you "should say anything good

about Jews" that I told you that some Jews also committed crimes of violence, not only the slinky, furtive crimes you had laid at our door. We have indeed Jews who are as bad as any. It is no part of my job to whitewash Jews, but I am not going to stand by and see them all blackened either. There are blackguards and murderers among Jews, as there are among every human group. And when I pointed out that lots of people who were not Jews had been convicted of arson and fraudulent bankruptcies and your other "typically Jewish crimes", it was for the same reason. In spite of the funny stories about Ikey and his fire, the lists of convictions show plenty of other names too. The implication that every Jew because he is a Jew is an actual or potential fire-raiser is very definitely bearing false witness against your neighbour.

Dr. Oscar Levy denying that the Jews are any better than the rest of the world repudiated his master, Nietzsche, who "believed he could see much in them that was praiseworthy. Perhaps," he suggested, "he agreed with Goethe: 'A fellow worthy of so much baiting is something fine.'"

But I agree on the whole with Dr. Oscar Levy there is little to choose between the plebs of Judaism and Christianity. Hugh Kingsmill writing of the English, says: "Excellence of any kind is rare, and does not become more common by being detected where it does not exist. It is as absurd to praise a nation collectively as to indict it collectively. It may be pleasant to be told in books that the English are kindly and just, etc. All this however bears very little relation to the reality of harassed, narrow lives, seldom lit up by any impersonal emotion, and only at rare intervals revealing the divinity latent in every human being." Here again you have your answer to your question whether Jews love international justice more than the English or the Scots or the Danes or the French. Of course,

the mass of them don't. Didn't I quote Zangwill saying that "Herzl had drawn from the Dreyfus case the conclusion that a settled and dignified life for the Jew would never be possible in Christendom. I, on the contrary, had drawn from it the conclusion that Zola was essentially a Jew and that in the organization of such lovers of justice throughout the world and in co-operation with them lay the true path for Israel, his true mission." He did not say "essentially a Jew" in any arrogant sense, but in the acceptance of such a man as fulfilling all the teachings of Judaism. "Hear, all ye people: hearken O earth, and all that therein is."

But Judaism and we who follow it have it as a special mission. It is not a strutting pride, but a sobering, humbling responsibility before God and man. It is the kind of feeling that writers and poets have, or should have. "I am diffident in saying that I far exceed the average", Mr. E. M. Forster said at the P.E.N. Congress. "You all come in here", he went on, addressing his fellow-writers, "you far exceed the average too. If I am making you feel shy let me put my faith in another way and call you 'rats'." It is not a matter of the term used. It is not, as Forster pointed out, to be "patronizing the general public". It is simply to affirm the acceptance, of a special task. Father D'Arcy, a Catholic theologian, expresses what I mean in this way: "To all historians, of whatever shade of belief, the Jews present a baffling spectacle. An insignificant and somewhat unamiable people, without distinction in art or science or law or political theory, in religion they tower above the contemporary peoples. They worship one true God among polytheists, they move steadily forward, purifying their conceptions. They are the children of a Promise, and walk in the light of a vocation from on high." The passion for justice is in Judaism (and its

daughter religions), not in being racially a Jew, any more than in being racially English or Scots or Turks. The "Jew" who is a heathen need be concerned with it; no more than any other heathen.

That is why I deplore it much more than you do that so many Jews fall aside from that vocation. "I believe the world needs Christianity, or I would not remain a Christian," Dr. James Parkes has written. "But I also believe the world needs Judaism." It is not given to mortal flesh and blood to live up to the highest ethics of either Christianity or Judaism, but the tragedy is that so many of both religions do not try. There, as I have said, should lie our common task.

I have never said that Jews do not oppress. They are human beings, subject to all human failings. If they oppressed less "it was not perhaps for lack of inclination", writes Dr. Cecil Roth, "to judge by the record of Rabinite relations with the Karaite sectaries, or at a later date the Chassidic enthusiasts. Possibly it was rather for lack of opportunity." You suggest that when I "point, here or there, to the bad conduct of Jews" I "do so in the manner of a broad-minded man making an admission, but without directly relating it to anti-semitism, which we are discussing." I don't think that is true. I have had quite a lot to say in my time about the problem of the unpleasant Jew as a begetter of anti-semitism, though I would not say that he is the "onlie begetter". There are circumstances, too, which at times sweep us all into the maelstrom. When Hitler's storm-troopers in the first year they came to power thrashed all the worshippers coming out of the Synagogues in Berlin on the Jewish New Year they did not stop to find out which were pleasant and which unpleasant. If it should happen here, I would not escape, nor many other Jews as good as I am or better.

I don't like Jews who insist on getting into hotels and golf-clubs where they are not wanted. You say they are thick-skinned. Again, I say that not only certain types of Jews are thick-skinned. I agree that people have a right to select their friends. Zangwill goes further. "It is difficult to connect the fostering of Jewish ideals with the admission of Jews into Gentile hotels," he says. "If they are orthodox Jews they have no right to be in those hotels at all. The hotel keepers, for their part, have a perfectly valid defence. If the Jewish isolation be divinely valuable, maintain it. But if Christian civilization be wholly admirable, then in God's name embrace it unreservedly. Charles Lamb raised the same issue from the Christian standpoint. 'If they are converted, why do they not come over to us altogether?'"

I cannot speak for Zionists, but I should be very much surprised if in a choice between England and Palestine "there is probably not a convinced Zionist in this country who would not count England well lost for the attainment of his enduring dream." I shall quote one distinguished British Zionist, Mr. Leonard Stein, the President of the Anglo-Jewish Association, who recently declared: "It is perfectly possible to be a Zionist, as I have long been myself, and at the same time as a British Jew to resent and repudiate the abuse heaped upon this country by certain groups of American Jews in supposed furtherance of the Zionist cause."

And if you tell me about Jews demonstrating against Britain in Palestine, the same thing is being done by Arabs in Egypt and elsewhere. "Thousands of Egyptians shout outside the British Embassy 'Down with England,'" writes a correspondent in *The Times*. "These Egyptians do not pause to reflect upon their fate if Rommel after a victory of El Alamein had escorted Mussolini into Cairo." And *The Times* speaks in an editorial of "the attacks on

British soldiers in Egypt with the bombs of Cairene and Alexandrian assassins”.

This paragraph should be put beside the remark in a Northampton paper that “many people cannot but think how different would be the reaction to assassination and sabotage if Afrika Korps Hans was in Palestine instead of Tommy Atkins”.

In Europe, too, Britain trying to keep the ring is attacked by both sides. “We are in Trieste trying to hold the ring between the Italians and the Slovenes. But we get no thanks from anybody,” writes a London newspaper correspondent from Trieste. “Englishmen here,” he adds, “are losing patience with the irresponsible and excitable element of the population who shower insults upon our troops and our country.”

That is the spirit in many countries, and you must not try to suggest that it is something peculiarly “Jewish”, found only among the “Jewish terrorists”.

The Dacoits in Burma are wrecking British military trains and killing British soldiers.

The same thing is happening in India where gunmen drive through the streets firing machine-guns from “terror-taxis”. There is “an atmosphere of violence, lawlessness and fear.” The Moslems organize “direct action to escape British slavery and Hindu domination”, and leading Moslems, headed by Sir Firoz Khan Noon, whom I met in London when he was Indian High Commissioner here, publicly renounce their British distinctions. “It is hopeless,” says Mr. Jinnah, the Moslem League President, “to attempt to solve India’s problems by peaceful and amicable means. To-day we have forged a pistol and are in a position to use it.”

I am not justifying terrorism by Jews, but in Palestine it was not the Jews who started the terrorism. In 1929, the High Commissioner for Palestine at the time, Sir John



Chancellor, condemned the Arab "ruthless and blood-thirsty evil-doers," whose "crimes have brought upon their authors the execration of all civilized peoples throughout the world". And in 1936 the Palestine Arabs under Fawzi Kawukji waged what he described as "victorious battles with the great Imperial enemy to expel the British from the Arab lands".

There is something reminiscent of the present situation in Palestine, but from the Arab angle in this report from Jerusalem in the *Daily Telegraph* of 14th September, 1936: "Sir Arthur Wauchope, the High Commissioner for Palestine, at an interview with the Arab Higher Committee yesterday gave a warning that from to-morrow General Dill will take control of the country. A prominent member of the Committee assures me that all the committee-members wished to see the end of the terrorism, but declared that a simple declaration by them would not be enough to restore order. It is clear that the prospect of martial law holds no terrors for members of the committee greater than those to which they would be exposed from the revolutionary element if they were to call for the abandonment of resistance. They would be in acute fear of reprisals from the terrorists."

A writer in the *Jewish Chronicle* has been drawing a parallel between the Jewish terrorists in Palestine and the terrorists in Ireland. It sent me to Wells's *Outline of History*. "Methods of insurrection and exasperation on the one hand and a policy of repression on the other," he writes, "were making the whole country a field of guerilla warfare. The insurgents raided, ambushed, assassinated, and fought little pitched battles with small detachments of troops. The English troops, well-behaved at first, were presently tempted and encouraged to embark upon 'reprisals'. There was a steady crescendo of outrages. Every murder led to fresh murders on one side or the other. At

last no one was safe in his home and his bed. It was with difficulty and to the tune of nocturnal shots and screams that the Irish Free State struggled into being."

Nor have the Irish become reconciled now. In an editorial on the Terrorist outbreaks in Palestine, the *Dublin Irish Press* blames Britain for having "by her sharp practice brought herself into this entanglement. Few in this country", it proceeds, "will have any sympathy with Britain for the mess this piece of sharp practice got her into. Indeed we look forward to the time when the world will as clearly understand how we too were tricked by mutually exclusive promises, and the partition of our country carried out by even a worse deception than that practised on the Jews and Arabs. The Irish are also a widely distributed race and are capable of making Partition as awkward a matter for its authors as the Balfour Declaration to the Jews and the Sykes Correspondence with the Arabs have since proved to be."

History is full in all countries of periods of terrorism. Palestine has known them before. The Zealots who resisted the Romans, established, according to Josephus, a reign of terror. "The Pharisees, who were anxious for the spiritual rather than the political independence of the Jews, counselled submission to Rome. But the Zealots desired political as well as religious freedom, and they fomented rebellion."

Remember that these Jewish terrorists in Palestine to-day are desperate people, many of them survivors of the Nazi death camps, who were waiting for their turn to go to the crematoriums when the liberation came. They are "hardened and used to hardship," writes a newspaper correspondent. "Many are young people and not easy to control. They know too much of sabotage and destruction. To survive they have learned to murder, rob, steal, pillage and lie. These are the people who are being

recruited for the Jewish illegal army and then smuggled into Palestine.”

Lawlessness has affected Jews like others. “That’s the new Esperanto”, Koestler in his book makes his Jewish terrorist in Palestine say, patting with his fist the gun under his leather jacket. “Surprising how easy it is to learn. Everybody understands it, from Shanghai to Madrid. We have to speak the language they understand.”

Dr. Zalman Grinberg, the President of the Council of Liberated Jews in Germany puts it less dramatically. “The few who have survived have wounded bodies and scarred souls,” he says. “A year after liberation we are still in camps. We have become objects of study. Commissions come to decide what is to happen to us. We are stateless and homeless. What the crematoriums of Europe could not swallow has stuck in the throat of international politics. There lies the reason why broken and tormented human beings wander through the streets and fields of Europe, braving danger to cross the borders. Palestine, the only spot in the world ready and willing to accept us is barred.”

The Anglo-American Commission of Enquiry declared in its Report that “Palestine alone cannot meet the emigration needs of the Jewish victims of Nazi and Fascist persecution. The whole world shares responsibility for them and indeed for the resettlement of all ‘displaced persons’.” But the Report continues: “We have to report that such information as we received about countries other than Palestine gave no hope of substantial assistance in finding homes for Jews wishing or impelled to leave Europe.”

So since legal immigration is barred everywhere, there is illegal immigration and mostly (though I wish some of it were directed towards America) for ideological reasons due to a long-sustained propaganda towards Palestine.

People who have no homes try to seize homes. Like the "squatters" in England. And if the Communists exploited the desperate plight of the homeless and overcrowded for Communist political ends, they were only taking advantage of an opportunity. They did not create it. Any more than the Zionists created the Jewish homelessness in Europe.

The world has drifted into a state of chaos. I believe it will shake itself down again. There will be homes built for people. And there will be homes again in their own countries for people who are now homeless and displaced. I do not look for utopias, only for ordinary decent living conditions for human beings who are willing to work for them. But meanwhile we must face the unpleasant realities. And one of them is the present terrorism in Palestine and (in the words of the Tel Aviv Municipality) the "senseless shedding of blood".

That isn't the end of the story. Your friend who was invited to a rally of Zionist youth in London and felt that he might have been at a Hitler Youth gathering, "the same fanaticism, the same intolerance", is saying what many Jews have said. Dr. Weizmann, the Zionist leader, has said it. Dr. Magnes, the head of the Jerusalem Hebrew University, has said it in Jerusalem. But those same young people, in more settled conditions, will grow older and calmer. I have seen it happen to other fanatics, Jewish and non-Jewish. There is an American Republican Congressman, Mr. J. C. Baldwin, who described himself as "a staunch friend of Britain", whose ancestors were "Shinn Feiners who themselves used violence against Britain".

I would add that if anyone tries to draw a distinction between the British Government and the Jews, or the British troops and police in Palestine and the Jews, it should not be forgotten that this same British Government which is now confronting the Jews in Palestine and the

Zionists contains several Jews, who have not dissociated themselves from its policy, not even Lord Nathan who was regarded before he took office as a Zionist, and that there are Jews among the British troops and police and civil servants in Palestine, and among those who have fallen victims to "Jewish terrorism" in the King David Hotel explosion and elsewhere. I could name some of these Jewish dead. I know one Jew whose brother was killed in the King David Hotel explosion. Another wrote to me that her husband had been in the King David Hotel at the time of the explosion. He escaped, but many of his friends were killed, Jews among them. A Jewish friend of mine who was a British officer in the war has had his brother, a British officer, shot and wounded by Jewish terrorists in Palestine. There are Jewish C.I.D. men and Jewish civilians among the victims of the Jewish terrorists.

"Acts of madness", the Vaad Leumi, the Jewish National Council of Palestine, calls this Jewish terrorism. "These acts which have caused the loss of life of innocent soldiers, policemen and citizens," it says in its proclamation, "are heinous and unforgivable crimes. They are committed by groups who have cast off all ties of discipline and obedience to the Yishub. The Executive of the Vaad Leumi joins the Inner Zionist Council in its appeal to the entire Yishub to isolate these groups and deprive them of all encouragement and support."

Even the statement issued from 10, Downing Street in August, 1946, in which the Government announced its decision to send illegal Jewish immigrants to Cyprus, speaks of the terrorists as "an unscrupulous minority". "It is the work", writes the Palestine correspondent of the *Zionist Review*, of "a few irresponsible men of violence."

The Government in lifting martial law in Palestine has taken the opportunity to pay tribute to the co-operation of the Jews of Palestine in rounding up terrorists, and I

should add, at the risk of their lives, for many of these "informers" have been murdered by the Jewish terrorists, and the British authorities have not been able to give them protection.

And since so much wild anti-British talk comes from certain Zionists in America, who boast that they supply the terrorists with money (as the Irish Americans provided funds for the Irish Shinn Fein) we should take note of the declaration of an important body like the United Jewish Appeal in America, which includes the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee and the United Palestine Appeal, that "in conformity with the nature of its purpose of using its funds for humanitarian relief and reconstruction, none of the funds raised by the United Jewish Appeal or expended by any of its agencies is utilized in the furtherance of any terrorist activity. The United Jewish Appeal", the statement goes on, "records its abhorrence of the terrorism that has been launched in Palestine by the two terrorist organizations whose activities have been unequivocally condemned by the Jewish Agency for Palestine and all other responsible Jewish bodies. It condemns the acts that have been perpetrated as injurious to the best interests of Jewry."

I am not trying to minimize or to exonerate. But there is another angle to it, besides that which you emphasize. And English Jews don't like it. Even Mr. Easterman, who is at the opposite end to Mr. Leonard Stein in Anglo-Jewish affairs and in Zionism, has been driven to write a letter published in the *New York Congress Weekly*, the organ of his own World Jewish Congress, remonstrating with it for its anti-British tone, and complaining of the "lack of restraint in the current storm of abuse now being levelled against the British by Jews in the United States".

You raise a different issue when you ask what British Jews would have done had Britain allied herself in the last

war with Hitler's Germany. Probably what the Catholics did under Elizabeth and the Huguenots in France after St. Bartholomew's Night. For presumably with such an alliance Jews would have been treated here as Jews were treated in Germany. Macaulay's argument still holds: "The feeling of patriotism, when society is in a healthful state, springs up by a natural and inevitable association in the minds of citizens who know that they owe all their comforts and pleasures to the bond which unites them in one community. But under a partial and oppressive Government these associations cannot acquire that strength which they have in a better state of things. Men are compelled to seek from their party that protection which they ought to receive from their country, and they by a natural consequence transfer to their party that affection which they would otherwise have felt for their country. Would it be fair to infer that at present the French Protestants would wish to see their religion made dominant by the help of a Prussian or English army? Surely not. And why is it that they are not willing, as they formerly were willing, to sacrifice the interests of their country to the interests of their religious persuasion? The reason is obvious: they were persecuted then, and are not persecuted now. It has always been the trick of bigots to make their subjects miserable at home and then to complain that they look for relief abroad."

May I add that not only have I never wanted to gate-crash into hotels or golf-clubs where I am not wanted, but that I would not wish to gate-crash into the English entity if that entity as a whole made it clear that I am not wanted. The point is whether your tribal definition of the English entity is what the English people as a whole accept. Professor George Catlin writes: "By Anglo-Saxonry is meant not a racial but a cultural bloc, with common traditions, habits, culture and (by and large)

political views. The very core of that culture is a notion not of race, but of freedom."

The same "hapless Ormsby-Gore" (now Lord Harlech) whom Dr. Weizmann, according to you, was able to bully so unmercifully, though the results do not seem to have been so good for Dr. Weizmann, once said, as the official representative of Great Britain: "This Aryan doctrine and the doctrine of homogeneity quite frankly cannot apply to the British Empire. It has always been a cardinal principle of the British Empire that no person shall be debarred from holding any office under the Crown, or from occupying posts in any profession or the like. That is fundamental."

"The British Empire, which has over and over again produced the mixed State, where various races and religions have lived together", writes the *Catholic Tablet*, "ought to uphold the idea that the mixed State is a higher achievement than the homogeneous State."

I shall not say as some Jews may say, as Mrs. Bertram Jacobs, for instance, is reported to have said at a Conference of the Liberal Jewish Synagogue (*Jewish Chronicle* 12th October, 1945) that "She first and foremost thought of herself as an Englishwoman. She would allow to her Judaism no prior claim, no conflicting loyalty." I don't think there need be any conflicting loyalty, but if being English were made to mean also being Christian, I should not hesitate to give my Judaism prior claim.

Colonel Robert Henriques, for whose services to Britain you express the highest regard, is very enthusiastic, as he says himself, about a principle which he would like to guide every English Jew—"As Jews and as Englishmen to play our part in the rebuilding of the world on the basis of liberty, justice and truth. How? By a stronger religious Jewish life." I should like to add about the "Jewish Army" demand to which you refer, that many of those who



like myself supported it were not seeking segregation as a national unit, but a form of distinctiveness within the national forces, so that there should be a visible answer to the specific Hitlerist war against Jews and Judaism. The intention was to wear proudly the David emblem which the Jews in Nazi lands were forced to wear as a badge of shame and thus to be identifiable, and not as Jews anonymous, in meeting the Jew-baiters. It was as justified I think in the special circumstances as the soldiers of different countries in the Crusades all wearing the Cross as their symbol.

And why did the Crusades start? Wasn't it because of the reports that the Turks were ill-treating Christians in Palestine? People have a habit of hitting back. Lord Grey once remarked of himself: "This animal is very naughty. When he is attacked he defends himself." Why should you expect Jews alone not to show resentment and try to exercise what retaliatory power they have when they think they are attacked? Does the brewer give his advertisement to papers which make a habit of attacking the drink traffic? I can give you examples of withdrawal of advertising which had nothing to do with Jews. I remember a London paper being very indignant about an insult to British womanhood in an American magazine which carried British advertising and demanding its withdrawal. Richard Keane writing before the war about German policy under Hitler, said: "Outside Germany various means of pressure are used. The most potent in every country except England, where the newspapers are few but wealthy, is the direct expenditure of money. Sometimes this will go straight to the proprietor. More often than not all the German advertising is placed through a central agency that disposes in addition of a Government subsidy. Valuable advertising space is booked only in those newspapers whose political views suit Germany."

Mr. Raymond Postgate has urged that to keep in power the Labour Government "should control Radio broadcasting and other forms of propaganda, including the Press", because "the existing Press is corrupt, as it depends upon the will of the advertisers." Is "the will of the advertisers" a "Jewish will"? Mosley when he used to attack "Press freedom" complained that "in practice it means the right of a few millionaires to corner newspaper shares and to voice their own opinions and interests". I have not heard that Lord Rothermere or Lord Beaverbrook or Lord Kemsley or Lord Camrose are Jews.

In Germany, before the Nazis came to power, withdrawal of advertisements from the "Jewish Press" and the entire non-Nazi Press was a favourite Nazi device. In 1931, for instance, the *Neue Nationalzeitung* in Augsburg, used to print the following over its advertisement pages: "Party members and followers of the National Socialist movement don't buy from Jews. Advertise in the *Neue Nationalzeitung*."

Even here I have seen labels stuck up, reading "Jewish shop. Don't buy." Jews may be wrong at times about their definitions and hasty in jumping to conclusions, but most of us when we get kicked want to knock the other fellow down.

I believe too that with many Jews, even where the protest is exaggerated and the cause of it misunderstood, as happens with the best of us, the intention is not to impose a power rule, but to give expression to an honest indignation, the kind of feeling that led so many people here to demand sanctions against Italy when Mussolini marched into Abyssinia, "because", as Rose Macaulay put it, "the English thought it a dirty deal, immoral, not cricket."

There can be too much of this "protest mentality". And I know there are Jews who are prone to call any

criticism anti-semitic, and that there are Zionists who speak of every opponent of Zionism as an anti-semite. But these also speak of Jews who oppose Zionism or are not as staunchly Zionist as they are themselves, as "traitors". It is not true of all Jews. I have found for instance an interview in the *Jewish Chronicle* hailing Henri de Kerrilis as "a champion against anti-semitism", though he declares himself in the same interview an anti-Zionist. "I am an anti-Zionist", he said, "because I consider the Jews in France, who have lived here for many generations, are just as good Frenchmen as are the Catholics and the Protestants." "I did not argue with M. de Kerrilis upon his attitude to Zionism," the *Jewish Chronicle* interviewer comments. "I had come to discuss only his wonderful fight against anti-semitism in France."

"It is quite right to complain when Jews resent as anti-Jewish an act that is not so intended", Watchman has written in a *Jewish Chronicle* article. "But it is not always easy to detect motives." Jews were at one time angry with Paderewski, because a newspaper which was published in Poland under his name conducted a pogrom agitation. Paderewski has told the story in his memoirs. The editor came to see him in London. "What kind of a paper is it?" I enquired. 'Why, it is an anti-Jewish paper', he answered, 'of course.' 'An anti-Jewish paper! But I do not see any necessity for that.' 'Ah!' he exclaimed. 'You say you do not see that necessity. But we see that necessity. It is very necessary. It is the most important political problem of Poland at this moment.' 'No, no, you are mistaken', I said. 'It is not. The most important problem is our independence, our liberty, not our strife with any part of the population. I do not agree with you at all.' 'Well, it is too late now. You cannot help it', he said. 'It is done. You cannot change it.' 'And with my money', I thought."

I think most people smart under criticism, but all Jews

do not therefore imagine that criticism can be stopped. I have heard objections to attempts to secure legislation against anti-semitism expressed at Jewish meetings, at meetings of the Jewish Board of Deputies. A special committee of the Board which considered this question said in its report: "The committee has no intention of seeking to check justifiable criticisms of individual Jews or of a community, when such criticisms are expressed in a fair manner, but as matters stand at present the community is saddled with charges of a nature which must be known to those who make them to be without foundation and which are uttered not in the cause of truth, but to create disunity and to excite hatred against a law-abiding section of His Majesty's subjects." In the *Contemporary Jewish Record* I read an article on this subject, which says: "To awaken popular demand for 'outlawing anti-semitism'—or as it turns out to be 'outlawing bigotry'—may be inviting inevitable rebuff. To prohibit the denunciation of racial and religious groups is to provide immunity from criticism for even the most perverse group. Hence the first small step in the direction of 'outlawing anti-semitism' is contested by those who loathe anti-semitic agitation, but consider freedom of speech the primary and indispensable ingredient of the democratic way of life."

Your story about Dr. Infeld is very interesting, but it can be balanced by many similar stories about gifted men who were not Jews, and who felt no more bound to one land or people, considering themselves sons of humanity. At the other end of the scale there are the adventurers and the soldiers of fortune who are equally at home anywhere. It is not a "Jewish" characteristic. The cosmopolitan and the internationalist are human types. Edward John Trelawney belonged to a Cornish family famous in English history, but "it was as natural for him to take service under the French flag as it was for Thomas Paine to join

Washington's army. Trelawney would have said with Paine, 'Where liberty is not there is my country'. He recognized no ties of kinship or comradeship or loyalty save with men who were fighting against despotism." And the desire of people in another land to identify themselves with it, to feel at home there, is natural, though I have never been able to understand it myself. George Moore tells us that he had spent ten years in France, "not an indifferent spectator, but an enthusiast, striving heart and soul to identify himself with the environment, to shake himself free from race and language and to recreate himself as it were in the womb of a new nationality, assuming its ideals, its morals and its modes of thought, and I had succeeded so well that when I returned home I was in touch with nothing; an Englishman was at that time as much out of my mental reach as an Esquimaux would be now." Julian Green is another who has written of Paris as his home. "Who can feel sad about returning home, when home means Paris? I realized that I had longed so desperately for Paris that I had never left it in spirit, because I was a part of it, just as it was a part of me." James Ensor, the painter, though his father was English, spent his life in Belgium and is in painting typically Belgian and Flemish, "his national heritage", the art critics say. These are the artists and the writers, and I met many such Frenchified Englishmen, Irishmen and Americans in Paris. I also met others, who were not artists or writers, who had simply slipped away from their English moorings, younger sons, black sheep, some of them, who had gone native, lost all contact with England except on mail days, those of them who were remittance-men. I understand they are to be found in every country. The Infeld type, good or bad, is not specifically Jewish.

Many people think first of their own advantages, and would not hesitate to go elsewhere if they found things

difficult at home or believed they would find them easier abroad. I have recently seen correspondence in the London Press and heard casual conversations which indicate that a good many people who are fed up with the performances of the Labour Government are thinking of emigrating, to the Colonies or to America. After the first war too, a good many English people, including ex-officers, emigrated to America, where they found more opportunity, and have become Americans.

There is also a good deal of inter-marriage, particularly after such a war, which brought so many foreign troops to England. Even Monty's niece is married to a Polish officer. And the G.I. Bride is counted in her thousands.

Then you ask me about Fry's quotations from the "Talmudic book *Shulchan Arak*". The trouble with Fry is that he repeats all the old stories about the Talmud that you find in Alfred Rosenberg and Julius Streicher and such publications as the *Jews' Who's Who*. It runs in harness with the ritual murder lie and the chalking up of "P.J." signs and swastikas on the walls. The Rev. Dr. Herbert Danby, Canon of Christ Church and Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford, deals with that particular passage which you quote, and this is what he says about it: "It is hardly possible to take at their face value the references to what the Talmud is alleged to lay down about Jewish dealings with Gentiles. When the Talmud enjoins rules for Jewish relations with idolaters (literally so) in the non-Christian East in the second century, these cannot obviously be taken as laws governing Jewish relations to their Gentile neighbours to-day. This is not merely self-evident, but it is emphasized by the successive commentators of the Jewish codes. In general, the reader must bear in mind that a considerable number of extracts are made to bear a nonsensical or a sinister meaning owing to the suppression of the context or ignorance of the argu-

ment of which the extract is a fragment. An excellent example is offered by the astonishing passage according to which Jewish Law gives Jews complete liberty to loot the goods of their heathen neighbours. The example is typical as showing the need to grasp the technical points of the subject which the Talmud is discussing. The argument turns on the difference between Jewish Law (which requires an act of 'taking into possession' by the purchaser to constitute a valid act of sale) and Persian Law (which considered a deal concluded when the seller had received payment). The problem then arises: 'What is the status of property for which the Gentile seller has received payment, but which the Jewish would-be-buyer has not yet "taken into his possession"?' The Talmud thereupon says, 'Rabbi Jehudah, in the name of Samuel, says: "The property of the Gentiles is like deserted property, and anyone taking possession of it has a good title to it; for the Gentile by accepting the money has renounced his ownership, and the Jewish would-be-buyer has not validly acquired it so long as he has not received his title-deeds." The same page in the Talmud goes on to lay down the fundamental law, permanently valid for Judaism, that the law of the State is law also for the Jews.' "

"It would be merely tiresome to deal with each quotation in turn," Dr. Danby adds. "It is open to any reader to check the bulk of them by reference to the Goldschmidt German Talmud or the Soncino English Talmud. The passages are, it hardly needs to be pointed out, chosen in a spirit of malice and malignity. We pass over the type of mentality which finds it proper to approach an ancient document solely with the object of ferreting out absurdities and fatuities, or details which offend against present-day fashions of reticence. The same process can be applied with equal effect to any other ancient literature, Oriental or classical; but it is a process which is not admirable and

is more characteristic of prurient and misguided adolescence than of objective scholarship. What may not however be passed over is the contented ignorance or irresponsible malice which—as happens in many of these extracts—presents passages in such a manner that their intended damaging effect depends on (a) being misunderstood in themselves (b) being given a false sense owing to separation from their context, or (c) being wrongly quoted. An undue proportion of Herr Rosenberg's quotations fall under one or another of these condemnations."

Your quotation from "the Jew Asher Ginsberg", who wrote as Achad Ha'am, is correct, as far as it goes. But it continues: "This is our Law, couched in the only form which was possible in the Middle Ages: just as the Talmud is our Law in the form which it took in the last days of the ancient world and just as the Bible is our Law in the form which it took while the Jews still lived as a nation on their own land. The three books are but three milestones on the road of a single development. Each corresponds to the nation's condition and needs in a different period."

The whole purpose of Achad Ha'am's essay, whose trend is indicated by its title, "Ancestor Worship", was to take up the challenge of an Italian Rabbi who had attacked the Shulchan Aruk, on the ground that "it contains many laws that are distasteful to us, and that such laws should be abolished, and we should proclaim aloud, in season and out of season, that this is not our law." "Undoubtedly this article is right in the main", wrote Achad Ha'am. "All the sections and paragraphs from the Shulchan Arak which the author quotes are certainly quite foreign to our spirit at the present day; certainly 'there is not a single Jew of modern education who can believe in them'." But he argued that it had expressed the spirit of the Jews at the time, had been a milestone on the road.



"This is our Law, couched in the only form which was possible in the Middle Ages."

Dr. Herbert Loewe, who was an orthodox Jew, wrote: "It simply will not do to say that the difference between the Orthodox and the Liberals is that the former do and the latter do not obey the rulings of the Shulchan Aruk. This is commonly said, but it is inexact. What we mean is that the Liberals keep less of that code than do the Orthodox. I have yet to find a Jew who observes every detail of the Shulchan Aruk."

Have I answered your question by explaining that Judaism is a living, growing system of belief and practice, with no finality, but with a constant re-interpretation and re-codifying of the fundamental God-given laws, according to the times in which we live?

And what has the Shulchan Aruk to do with the kind of thing we have been hearing in the treason trials, as when Cooper, a former B.U.F. man, was reported to have declared himself "a complete Fascist, dissatisfied with the whole of the capitalistic and political situation in England, and had left England after badly injuring a Jew. He intended to stay in Germany. He had taken part in atrocities against Jews, and himself had killed several. He used to boast about this. He said he would do the same for the Germans if they came to this country." "Before going to Germany, Cooper had been a member of that subversive body, the British Union of Fascists," Lord Goddard said in giving judgment. Or let me take another example, a man named Lingshaw, who wrote from Germany to Mr. Churchill: "I am now in Germany and find things are quite different—so different that I am ashamed the B.B.C. are British; or are they Jews?" It is a twisted mentality, and a certain kind of anti-Jewish propaganda gives the twist. It does not follow that everyone is affected in the same way.

I made no innuendo about you. I am as sure as you are that had the British Isles been conquered the Germans would not have lacked collaborators here, and they would have come, as you say, from all sections of the population and from all parties, Liberals, Conservatives, Socialists, Communists and Fascists. A certain kind of renegade Jew, too, as there were on the Continent, despite the Aryan laws. "When a sect becomes powerful," said Macaulay, "when its favour is the road to riches and dignities, worldly and ambitious men crowd into it, talk its language, and frequently go beyond its honest members in all the outward indications of zeal." Among British Fascists there would, of course, I wrote, "have been individual exceptions, Jew-hating, sturdy British patriots", who would have stood out against the Nazi invaders and those British Jew-haters who, because of the common Jew-hatred would have been prepared to help Germany to rid the world of all Jews. You said this is not a book about anti-Leftwichism. Nor is it a book about anti-Chestertonism. I am thinking of the lengths to which some British anti-semites (and anti-semites are found not only among Fascists) went because they hated Jews more than they loved Britain. They were not all "servile wretches and sycophants", as you call them. Some, like Joyce, acted as they did out of principle and conviction. Joyce did not consider that he had done wrong. "I know I have been denounced as a traitor and I resent the accusation", he said.

But to you the division is simple—Jews on the one side, and "the good men of the land" on the other. So you advocate the restoration in England of the Statute of Jewry. I have a great respect for Magna Carta, but it is not the last word in human progress. It was a milestone, now more than 700 years behind us. Professor Somervell says of it: "Magna Carta was not quite so heroic a docu-

ment as seventeenth century parliamentarians imagined when they flourished it in the faces of Stuart kings. Its clauses did not enact Liberty, Equality or Fraternity in any of the modern sense of these illusive terms. In fact, the more we examine the letter of its sixty-three clauses, the less inspiring we find them." And incidentally, Green, in his *History of the English People*, reminds us that Simon de Montfort "was himself a foreigner". Even St. George was not an Englishman.

I prefer to think of a much older enactment: "But the stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself; for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt: I am the Lord your God. Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment, in meteyard, in weight or in measure. Just balances, just weights, a just ephah and a just hin shall you have: I am the Lord your God which brought you out of the land of Egypt. Therefore shall you observe all my statutes and all my judgments, and do them: I am the Lord."

Just balances, my dear Chesterton, just weights shall you have. I don't know what the reviewers will say about our book, but if they call me the defender of a persecuted "race" I shall have done my job badly. For what I am trying to defend is not a "persecuted race", but justice and right and the law of God.

J.L.

END